

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

23

VOL. XXII. No. 47
WHOLE No. 543

March 27, 1920

{ PRICE, 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

Chronicle

Peace Conference.—Constantinople with its ministries, was occupied by Allied forces on March 16. During the course of the same day, the Allied Commissioners issued a proclamation in

Constantinople Occupied

which it was stated that the occupation was provisional, without intention of destroying the Sultan's authority but rather of strengthening it, that the Entente Powers persist in their purpose of leaving Constantinople in the hands of the Turks, but that this purpose was conditioned on the absence of trouble and massacres. It is stated that the new occupation has for its object to prevent a recurrence of disorder and especially massacres, and is mainly political; it is to be continued until the terms of the Peace Treaty with Turkey, now in preparation, have been enforced. These terms, it is understood, will deprive Turkey of all its former territory except about two-thirds of Anatolia. President Wilson has been asked by the Allied Governments for an expression of his views on the Turkish question.

The Syrian Kingdom, which was proclaimed recently by the Damascus Congress, with Prince Feisal, son of the King of Hedjaz, as King, has failed of recognition. Both the British and French Governments have notified the Prince that they refuse to recognize his claim.

On March 15, in accordance with the provisions of the Versailles Treaty, a plebiscite was held in the second Slesvig zone to determine the future nationality of the region. The result was overwhelmingly in favor of German nationality and control.

Home News.—One of the unexpected developments of the last few days of debate on the treaty was the adoption by the Senate of the following resolution, which was

Rejection of Treaty

proposed by Senator Gerry, and was carried by a vote of thirty-eight to thirty-six in committee of the whole, and later by a vote of forty-five to thirty-eight:

In consenting to the ratification of the treaty with Germany the United States adheres to the principle of self-determination and to the resolution of sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of their own choice, adopted by the Senate June 6, 1919, and declares that when self-government

is attained by Ireland, a consummation it is hoped is at hand, it should promptly be admitted as a member of the League of Nations.

An effort was made to amend this reservation so as to include a similar expression of sympathy with the aspirations of Korea, but it was defeated.

On March 15 the Senate adopted the reservation on Article X drawn up by Mr. Borah. It read:

The United States assumes no obligation to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country by the employment of its military or naval forces, its resources, or any form of economic discrimination, or to interfere in any way in controversies between nations, including all controversies relating to territorial integrity or political independence, whether members of the league or not, under the provisions of Article X, or to employ the military or naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose unless in any particular case the Congress which, under the Constitution, has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military or naval forces of the United States, shall, in the exercise of full liberty of action, by act or joint resolution so provide.

This reservation was carried by a vote of fifty-six to twenty-six, and had for its purpose to win over the irreconcilable Senators. All the Republicans voted for it. Mr. Borah's reservation was adopted after the failure of the mild reservationists to win over the Democratic support to the Lenroot substitute proposal which represented the furthest concession the former were willing to make. It read as follows:

It shall be the declared policy of this Government that, the freedom and peace of Europe being again threatened by any power or combination of powers, the United States will regard such a situation with grave concern, and will consider what, if any, action it will take in the premises.

The proposal was defeated by a vote of thirty-nine to twenty-five, only two Democrats voting for it.

On March 19, for the second time, the Senate refused to ratify the Versailles Treaty, with the reservations recommended by the Foreign Relations Committee. After prolonged discussion, and with every likelihood of its being defeated, the resolution of ratification was put to the test, in the following form:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Treaty of Peace with Germany, concluded at Versailles

on the 28th day of June, 1919, subject to the following reservations and understandings, which are hereby made a part and condition of this resolution of ratification, which ratification is not to take effect or bind the United States until the said reservations and understandings adopted by the Senate have been accepted as a part and a condition of this resolution of ratification by the Allied and Associated Powers, and a failure on the part of the Allied and Associated Powers to make objection to said reservations and understandings prior to the deposit of ratification by the United States shall be taken as a full and final acceptance of such reservations and understandings by said Powers.

On the very last day the clause in the resolution which provided that the ratification was not to take effect unless the instrument embodying it was filed within sixty days after its adoption was removed, and Senator Brandegee's amendment which extended the time limit to ninety days was likewise rejected.

The vote, by which the treaty was finally disposed of, stood forty-nine in favor of ratification and thirty-five against it. Twelve Senators failed to vote, being paired; but if all had actually voted, the result would have been the same, for the vote would have stood fifty-seven in favor of ratification and thirty-nine against it. Even in this case the majority would have lacked seven votes of the requisite two-thirds, sixty-four votes being necessary for ratification. Twenty-eight Republicans and twenty-one Democrats voted for ratification, twelve Republicans and twenty-three Democrats voted against it.

After the treaty had been rejected, Senator Lodge proposed the following resolution to return the treaty to the President:

That the Secretary of the Senate be instructed to return to the President the Treaty of Peace with Germany signed at Versailles on the twenty-eighth day of June, 1919, and respectfully inform the President that the Senate has failed to ratify said treaty, being unable to obtain the constitutional majority required therefor.

This resolution was passed by a vote of forty-seven to thirty-seven. Immediately after it had been adopted, Senator Robinson moved that the vote on the resolution of ratification should be reconsidered. Senator Cummins, who was presiding, ruled that the motion was out of order. No exception was taken to this ruling, but Senator Lodge said he would ask unanimous consent that the vote be reconsidered, provided the vote were taken immediately. This did not fall in with the plans of the Democrats, who wished the vote to go over to March 22, and Senator Robinson eventually withdrew his motion on learning that the mild reservationists on whose support he had counted, would not stand with him. Senator Knox then moved that the Senate consider his resolution declaring the state of war between the United States and Germany at an end by repealing the resolution declaring war, adopted in April, 1917. Following this the Senate adjourned. On March 20 official information was conveyed to Mr. Wilson that the treaty had been rejected, and at the same time the treaty itself was returned to the White House.

Interest at present centers in the Knox resolution, which was introduced in the House by Representative Tinkham, on March 20, and referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee without debate.

The Knox Resolution

The Knox resolution reads as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House that the joint resolution passed April 6, 1917, "declaring a state of war exists between the Imperial German Government and the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same," be and the same is hereby repealed, to take effect upon the ratification of a Treaty of Peace between Germany and three of the principal Allied and Associated Powers; provided, however, that unless the German Government notifies the Government of the United States that it acquiesces in and confirms irrevocably to the United States all undertakings and covenants contained in the Treaty of Versailles conferring upon or assuring to the United States or its nationals any rights, powers or benefits whatever and concedes to the United States all rights, privileges, indemnities, reparations and advantages to which the United States would have been entitled if it were a ratifying party to the said treaty, the President of the United States shall have power by proclamation to prohibit commerce between the United States and Germany and the making of loans and credits and the furnishing of financial assistance or supplies to the German Government or the inhabitants of Germany directly or indirectly by the Government of the United States or the inhabitants of the United States.

Any violations of the prohibitions contained in such proclamation by the President shall be punishable as provided in section 16 of the Trading with the Enemy act.

Further resolved, that the United States reaffirms the policy expressed in the act of Congress of August 29, 1916, as follows:

It is hereby declared the policy of the United States to adjust and settle its international disputes through mediation or arbitration, to the end that war may be honorably avoided. It looks with apprehension and disfavor on a general increase of armament throughout the world and the authorization and the request is made in said act to the President that he "invite all the great Governments of the world to send representatives to a conference, which shall be charged with the duty of formulating a plan for a court of arbitration or other tribunal to which disputed questions between nations shall be referred for adjudication and peaceful settlement and to consider the question of disarmament and to submit their recommendations to their respective Governments for approval," is hereby renewed.

Further resolved, in the language of said act, that the representatives of the United States in said conferences "shall be qualified for the mission by eminence in the law and by devotion to the cause of peace," and said representatives shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This resolution, it is stated in Washington circles, will not be taken up in Congress for some days, in order to give the President an opportunity to indicate his policy. Mr. Wilson's reticence on the subject leaves it a matter of mere conjecture what step he will take. Should he send the treaty back to the Senate for reconsideration, Mr. Lodge says that it will not be taken out of the Foreign Relations Committee until after the November elections. Congress, however, will not wait indefinitely for the President to take action, and it is considered likely that the Knox resolution will pass in both Houses, if it is put to the vote.

Bolivia.—As a result of serious anti-Peruvian manifestations at La Paz, the Government at Washington made strong representations to Bolivia not to disturb the peace of South America. In connection with these communications it was urged that Peru had sought the friendly offices of the United States to prevent hostilities.

*Anti-Peruvian
Feeling*

Two notes were sent and it was expected that a third would be dispatched if necessary. The first was forwarded immediately after the official news reached Washington of the attack on the Peruvian consulate in the Bolivian capital, the second followed on March 17. Officials at first viewed the situation as serious, and the representations made by our State Department were described as urgent. Dispatches to the Peruvian Embassy in Washington stated that the anti-Peruvian feeling in Bolivia resulted from the "influence" of the Chilean Government and the activities of Chilean agents. Peruvian embassy officials expressed the belief that there was an effort to force Peru into a war with its former ally in the war of fifty years ago, out of which grew the dispute over the sovereignty of the Tacna-Arica territory, which has so long been a source of misunderstanding. A belief prevailed in Peru, and the charge was directly made by some Peruvians that General Montes, one of the candidates for the Bolivian Presidency, who was reported to be leading the anti-Peruvian manifestations, was being supported by Chile and was supplied with arms and ammunitions from that country. The exact situation in Bolivia was somewhat obscure, owing to the rigid censorship at La Paz. Reports which reached Peru that General Montes had mobilized Bolivian reserves caused deep concern. For, if the report proved true, Peru would also feel obliged to call out its own reserves, as its regular army consists of only a few thousand men.

Peru and Bolivia are members of the League of Nations. Were they to sever diplomatic relations, the crisis thus provoked, would, under the articles of the Covenant of the League, be of such a nature as to bring the dispute before the Council of the League. It was not however likely, in the light of subsequent events, that such a step would be necessary. But were it to take place, the case would have a peculiar interest, as it would afford the first test of the power and influence of the League. Should Peru and Bolivia fail to submit the controversy to the League, the Council, it was said, might take action on its own initiative. But since the Court of International Justice decreed for the purpose of adjudicating such disputes has not yet been organized, the Allied Supreme Council, it was said, would deal with the matter. Later dispatches from Peru state that the situation is becoming more tranquil. The Bolivian Chargé d'Affaires at Lima visited Chancellor Porras and expressed in the name of his Government regret for manifestations against Peruvians in Bolivia. He furthermore stated, according to *La Nacion* of Buenos Ayres in its dispatches from Lima, that his Government would punish the authors of the dis-

turbances. The dispatch adds that Chancellor Porras convened the Peruvian Chamber of Deputies and notified it that Bolivia had expressed its regrets. The Argentine Government has throughout the whole proceedings closely watched events in the interests of peace.

France.—Any official request on the part of Germany for a postponement of the demobilization and disarmament of her troops as laid down in the Treaty of Versailles will be vigorously opposed by the French Government. Public sentiment strongly opposes such a measure, chiefly on the ground that much of the danger to France as well as to Germany herself comes from her failure to decrease and disarm her troops in accordance with the Treaty of Versailles. The question has been the subject of animated discussion in Allied circles. While no official statement has been made, it is asserted that both Great Britain and Italy favor strengthening the hands of Germany's legal government by disarmament concessions. France, on the other hand, takes the attitude, that no matter what party is in power in Germany, the first duty of that Government is to observe the treaty obligations. It is expected that some compromise agreeable to all parties will ultimately be made. But so far, having failed to obtain the support of England and Italy, France is especially anxious to appeal to American opinion. In order to put her case clearly before the world, France maintains that the recent *coup* in Berlin could not have been possible, were it not for the fact that Germany's Baltic troops, which returned last year were kept in commission contrary to the terms of the treaty; that even where divisions were apparently demobilized, they were not so in fact, as the men, still keeping their arms and ammunitions and still paid by the Government were distributed over small estates, close to their officers, and ready to follow and obey them at a moment's notice, that Ebert's supporters of the Right openly favor resistance to disarmament, and that though General von Luettwitz is gone, his place has been taken by the capable and energetic von Seeckt, whom France considered one of the greatest German generals during the war. Such are the grounds on which France opposes further concessions. She affirms that these conditions are making her look into the future with something like alarm. She fears that a serious danger still threatens her. While many consider the chances of a new attack as remote, the general tone of the press is one of earnest insistence that nothing be allowed to interfere with the exact fulfilment of the terms of the Versailles Treaty. The *Temps* sums up the whole situation as viewed by the press in these words: "Will Germany develop along the lines of those who planned the *coup d'état*, or in a way in keeping with the Allies' security and the execution of the treaty? That is the whole question." During the disturbances in Berlin Marshal Foch carefully watched the strategic points along the Rhine.

Germany.—The Kapp *coup d'état* has come to a sudden end. The situation became critical when both von Hindenburg and the former Minister of Finance, Helfferich,

*The Course of Two
Revolutions*

refused aid to the revolutionists. Unable to obtain the necessary support, the self-appointed Chancellor and his Commander-in-Chief, Baron von Luttwitz, were forced to resign, again leaving the Ebert Government in control at Berlin. The confusion caused by this "operetta revolution," which had lasted just five days, afforded the Spartacans their longed-for opportunity. Soviets were at once declared in many sections, and various industrial districts, including Essen itself, fell into the hands of the Reds. Berlin also was for a time in a state of siege. Hundreds are said to have been killed or wounded. The attempts of the Spartacans, however, have apparently failed, equally with the Kapp adventure. In some cities the radical movement is seemingly waning and the men are returning to their work. This is particularly true of South Germany. The Spartacist radicals, or Independent Socialists, have in consequence of these events been split into two parties, an extreme Left and a more moderate Right. Their political power, however, is thought to have been considerably strengthened. Soviet agitators never relinquished their purpose and were merely held in restraint by force. Even should the present disorders be speedily ended, many months will pass before Germany can again recover from the disastrous results of the simultaneous Kapp and Spartacist revolutions. The real test of the Ebert Government will lie in overcoming the effects of its own general strike order against the "militarists," and in breaking down the efforts of the Independent Socialists to establish Communism in Germany. That it will be able to do so seems evident from the fact that the strike was called off on March 20 and that the following convention between the Government in Berlin and the Strike Committee on the same day agreed to the following convention:

- (1) The Government's representatives will intervene with the various political parties in order to reform the same. Prussian Cabinet Ministers will be nominated by agreement between the parties and the trade unionists.
- (2) The labor organizations will have a decisive influence in these nominations, respecting, however, the rights of Parliament.
- (3) Punishment of the leaders of the recent *coup*, including all officials and civil servants who supported the Kapp régime.
- (4) Democratization of all administrations and the dismissal of all who proved disloyal to the Constitution.
- (5) Immediate extension of existing social laws and the framing of new laws.
- (6) and (7) The immediate socialization of all industries, therefore nationalization of the coal and potash syndicates.
- (8) Confiscation of agricultural products and confiscation of land improperly and unintensively cultivated.
- (9) Dissolution of Reichswehr formations not loyal to the Constitution and their replacement by formations from the workmen, artisans and State teachers.
- (10) The resignation of Gustav Noske and Dr. Karl Heine.

Perhaps the most violent struggles were those that took place at Leipzig where dispatches state that 3,000 persons were killed before Government troops captured the city.

The Red Army is even reported to have available a force of 70,000 men in the Ruhr district, where the situation has been extremely critical. From the Rhineland it is reported in the latest dispatches, at the present writing, that at least four towns are governed by Soviet councils and that still other towns are controlled by Communist troops. The Essen Communists are said to number 10,000 well-armed workers and troops. Big guns, armored cars and airplanes are brought into action by the Communists. In Berlin itself, however, normal activities are likely to be resumed, public services have in a measure been restored and the wire entanglements and barricades of the Kapp dictatorship are removed. The Ebert Government is concentrating its loyal forces and hopes that their arrival at the scenes of disorder in the Rhine and Ruhr districts will restore quiet and discipline. Regarding the men who precipitated this two-fold revolution President Ebert says: "Those guilty shall feel the full weight of the law. All officers of responsible position and all leading civilians who joined wilfully will be regarded as guilty, will be charged with high treason, and may be punished with penal servitude." He expresses his thanks for the attitude of the foreign Governments during the crisis, especially to France and Austria. The National Assembly will meet in Berlin on March 25.

Ireland.—The morning papers of March 20 reported that Thomas MacGurin, Lord Mayor of Cork, was shot dead at his residence by a body of masked men who

*Mayor of Cork
Murdered*

entered his house at 1 a. m. Mayor MacGurin was a prominent Sinn Feiner, who was interned after the Easter revolt in 1916. He is said to have received a threatening letter a few days before, directing him to prepare for death but he paid no attention to the warning. On March 21 thousands of mourners passed through the City Hall where the remains of the Mayor lay in state. A procession two miles long, with Bishop Colahan walking at the head of the Cork Sinn Fein volunteers, had followed the hearse to the City Hall. An inquest into the Mayor's death was begun March 20, his family's solicitor requesting that no former policemen should serve on the coroner's jury. The Bishop of Cork urged that no reprisals be made for the murder of Mayor MacGurin, as Ireland's cause could not be advanced by outrages. "The only party to derive advantage from the crime wave in Ireland was the party which always had refused and still was refusing freedom to Ireland."

A number of prominent Sinn Feiners of Kerry were arrested on the morning of March 20 and placed on board a destroyer by the military authorities, their destination, it is presumed, being an English prison. Alexander McCabe, member of Parliament for South Sligo, after five years in jail for "political offenses," has been sentenced to three months in prison for promoting the Sinn Fein loan.

A Noteworthy Experiment

JOHN T. COMES

WE are hearing and reading a great deal these days about the guilds of the Middle Ages. Students of architecture and art as well as social workers look wistfully to the past and hope that somehow or other the old Catholic guild idea can be revived as a cure for many evils of the present day. The arts and crafts ever since the days of the guilds have been hobbling about on one foot. The fact that the designer cannot personally execute his designs, and that the craftsman must forever carry out the ideas of others, has brought about the present sad conditions in which the artistry and work of both suffer immeasurably, not to speak of the lack of joy the craftsman is deprived of in his work. No great art has ever been produced by the complete separation of the designer and the craftsman. Ruskin put it well when he said: "Life without labor is guilt and labor without art is brutality."

In these days of reconstruction, of groping around for some method to quiet the unrest of the workers, the guild idea looms up large as a solvent, and is being tried out in various parts of England with more or less success. The readers of AMERICA may be interested to learn of a similar experiment now being made here in this country.

"What," says the skeptic, "revive the arts and crafts, the guild system of the Middle Ages, build churches and cathedrals having a Divine beauty and a solidity that will endure for centuries, and in these days of profiteering and lack of faith? It can't be done! You might as well chase water up hill, banish the tractor and go back to the plow. These ideal days are gone, never to return." Well, this very thing is being done at the present moment in the town of Bryn Athen, less than an hour's ride from the "city of brotherly love." It is, of course, altogether proper that this unique modern experiment should be made on a large church, and it is also logical that it be tried by a man who has been a great champion of Gothic architecture in this country, as well as an admirer of the Catholic ages that produced it. I refer to Mr. Ralph Adams Cram of Boston, who is not only an enthusiastic preacher but a mighty doer of the word. Mr. Cram has often expressed his discontent with the present unsatisfactory condition of the building trades, and scarcity of good craftsmen, I mean those who really understand and love their work, and who look beyond the Saturday pay envelope.

I had read about this new church in Bryn Athen and the unique method adopted in its construction; so last week found me setting out, hot foot, from the station, in quest of the church, and the new guild. It was a bright snappy day, an ideal one for a cross country walk. The trees along the road cast intense blue shadows on the snow, and nature set the stage for one of the most agree-

able surprises of my life, which came upon me suddenly with a turn in the road. Before me rose a stately and massive pinnacled tower, such as one finds in England, where however, no such sparkle and contrast of light and shade is obtained by the sun, as we find here in Pennsylvania. Forgotten was the bustle and ugliness of the city, and it seemed as though I had reached a land of picturesque chapels nestling among the houses of pious peasants, or of hill-crowning churches that speak the glory of God and preach His beauty and perfection to men. After I had seen this remarkable church from every vantage point, had examined with care the interesting and varied details of construction and design, visited the adjoining shops, the "*bauhütten*" as the Germans call them, I was stunned with the sudden thought that although the design, and general plan of the church and the method of its construction were thoroughly Catholic, not a single soul as far as I know, who has anything to do with this noble enterprise is a Catholic, except perhaps Giovanni, the mortar mixer.

The church serves as a cathedral for the Swedenborgians who are quite numerous in the neighborhood. The fairy god-father of this enterprise is a millionaire with a love for Gothic architecture. He employs the men, criticizes the work, inspects models and passes on everything; the architect who initiated and developed the plans, not being connected with the work at present.

Not one of the modern commercial, contracting, rush, or machine methods have so far been resorted to. Everything that goes into the building is fashioned entirely on the grounds, in the huts surrounding the structure. The plans are being drawn in a separate building, by draftsmen familiar with this class of work. The stone is quarried and the wood is cut in the neighborhood, the carpenters make all the doors, frames, timber roofs and beautiful Gothic furniture, by hand, in the shop presided over by an expert carver; the ornamental iron work such as hinges and gates is wrought in the smithy, and even the stained glass for the windows is designed and made on the grounds, then placed in the church and, if necessary, is redesigned and remade until it satisfies the conditions of art and the place it is to occupy.

It seems as though one were stepping from the present into a former age, when a knowledge of art and fine craftsmanship was the proud possession of every workman. Many experiments are being made here which the busy artist in the world has no time or opportunity to make. For example a young Scotchman who is a member of a family of glass makers, has succeeded after many experiments in producing a beautiful glass for windows such as was used in the best period of this art in the thirteenth century. The wonderful limpid blue glass which gives so much sparkle to the famous

windows in Chartres Cathedral, is now being made in this country, and I believe it is the first time that this has been made anywhere since the thirteenth century.

I have no space to describe the church in detail which has thus revived the arts and crafts, but one peculiar and distinguishing mark of medieval architecture, which has been used here, must not be passed over. I refer to the optical refinements produced in the plan and the elevations which Professor Goodyear of Brooklyn Institute discovered in the ancient buildings and wrote about rather extensively, some years ago. It is a well known fact that the medieval builders abhorred straight lines, the right angle triangle, perfect symmetry, and mechanical regularity. Nearly all the churches built during the Gothic period deviated from the T square and the triangle methods of the modern architect's office. We know for example, that the sanctuary and choir of the old cathedrals and churches were bent to one side, off the main axis of the nave, and that the enclosing walls were never parallel, that the spacing of the pillars and piers was generally irregular, thereby raising and lowering the arches above them, according to the varying widths of the bays. The exterior walls and even the roofs presented an effect that can only be compared with the difference existing between a free hand drawing and one made by purely mechanical methods. For example, the nave in the Bryn Athen church is almost one foot wider in the center than at either end, the arches and piers vary in height and spacing, the lines of the tower over the crossing are not vertical, but are curved inward, thereby suggesting the entasis of a Greek column. The transepts and chapels have the same divergence from the square, in fact, the style of the church and method of building approaches as nearly that of the ages of faith as modern conditions permit.

Only an architect familiar with modern building problems and the ignorance of the average mechanic, can appreciate the great difficulties involved in such a procedure, and it heightens one's respect tremendously for the age that could produce such buildings, in almost every city, town and hamlet in Europe. It also shows how much has been lost to the Church, the craftsmen and the world through the revolution of the sixteenth century, which put an end to this almost ideal relation of art to the life of the people. As stated before the style of architecture, the honest methods of construction are all Catholic, though used in the present instance by a Protestant sect. It is of course not the first time, nor is architecture the only sphere in which the Church has supplied the example for others. As Dr. Walsh says, almost every movement of the present day which is really sound and good, has its roots somewhere in the Catholic past. We Catholics should, of course, be flattered that such is the case. On the other hand, one cannot help but ask the question, why all these good things in culture and art and social work should be almost exclusively fostered by those outside the fold. The best churches in the

United States have so far been erected by non-Catholics and the greatest number of students, writers and admirers of Catholic art, at least in this country, have been of the same faith. A distinguished editor once wrote me: "Every time I see a beautiful Gothic church along old Catholic lines I say to myself: another Protestant Church stealing our thunder." Perhaps now, that the Bishops will meet periodically to discuss matters of interest to the whole Church, some action may be taken to place the cause of Christian art and architecture on a sound Catholic basis.

We have paid all too dearly for our neglect and indifference in this matter and strange to say when a really fine Catholic Church like that of St. Vincent Ferrer in New York city is built, not a single article of appreciation appears in a Catholic periodical. We seem to ignore the good things of the present as well as those of the past. We have critical reviews on books, the theater, and so on, but on art or architecture, very few.

I am well aware of the fact that there is a difference of opinion as to whether the styles developed by the Church in former ages should be used at the present time or whether a new style should be created, expressing modern life and conditions. No man or group of men can say: "Go to, let us create a new style of architecture." One might as well say, let us create a new language of expression. There are very few influences in the present age to encourage the development of a new style of architecture, at least in this country, where so many conflicting elements jostle each other and clamor for expression, or perhaps are too indefinite to be expressed.

The development of a living art is a slow process and comes only with a unified and natural effort of all the people. In the meantime, however, we need churches and the past must continue to offer the principles to guide us; not that we should copy literally any particular church, any more than a composer should copy any particular Gregorian or Palestrina Mass. The composer must work along certain well established lines approved by the Church, yet the artist is free within these limits to use his imagination to create something that will be entirely his own.

The church in Bryn Athen is an individual and distinctive work of art, through which, however, may be seen the warp and woof of medieval architecture and operating conditions, at their best. I take it that this, for the present, is the safe and sane way to follow.

The experiment in Bryn Athen shows what can be done nowadays to rehabilitate the arts and crafts, and to unite them again for the service of the Church. What Mr. D. A. Lord says in *AMERICA* regarding the Catholic drama can with equal force be said about Catholic art and architecture and the revival of the arts and crafts. We have the ideals, the background and the people, to create; who shall bring them all together. Could not the Bishops in conjunction with architects work out a

comprehensive practical plan to take our art out of the present vicious system and place it back into the position it occupied in former ages? Let us have a discussion of this question in AMERICA.

The Superstition Called Spiritism

C. P. BRUEHL

THE existence of superstition bears eloquent testimony to the ineradicable religious instinct implanted in the soul of man. Wherever this instinct is denied legitimate satisfaction, it crops out in practices which, according to the peculiar trend of the times, assume various forms. Superstition is an aberration from the virtue of religion by way of excess. It consists in attributing to creatures what belongs to God, thus defrauding the Creator of honor that is His unique privilege. Its source is ignorance in religious matters. Naturally, it will flourish among those whose religious instruction has been neglected. The guilt of superstition is very great, because God is extremely jealous of His honor. This, of course, applies to the objective sinfulness involved in superstitious practices; subjective factors may reduce the individual guilt almost to the vanishing point. Credulity lies at the root of all superstition; but, if one were to conclude from this fact, that it is only found among the unlettered, he would be greatly mistaken. The most enlightened in a worldly sense are not exempt from grossly superstitious beliefs and practices. Only sound religious knowledge makes one immune against the subtle influence of this insidious perversion of the religious sense.

Our own age, though it boasts of its enlightenment, witnesses a recrudescence of superstition in the form of Spiritism. It is remarkable that, whereas formerly men practised the occult arts in a rather shamefaced manner, Spiritism, the lineal descendant of these arts, is quite openly indulged in and has become fashionable in the very best circles. Reputable scientists sponsor it, and men of all ranks proclaim themselves its ardent adherents and staunch champions. We would like to read the comment of future historians on this mental epidemic of our generation. Their verdict might not be very flattering to our vanity. Possibly, they may put us in a class with the benighted peoples of what we contemptuously style the Dark Ages. This, indeed, would be the irony of history and a well deserved nemesis. But history sometimes has its little jokes and humorous retributions.

The specific form of superstition represented by Spiritism is technically known as divination. By this we understand the endeavor to extract from creatures, particularly from the inhabitants of the spirit world, knowledge of things which God, in His ordinary economy, screens from mortal eyes. Man's curiosity has at all times prompted him to lift the veil interposed between his vision and the secrets of Divine Providence. As no good spirits would lend their assistance to efforts

contrary to the intentions of God, communications obtained in this manner by divinatory imprecations have always been attributed to diabolical agencies, though they profess to emanate from other sources. Few would deliberately seek intercourse with the evil spirits, and, hence, explicit evocation of demons for the purpose of obtaining hidden truth is a rare occurrence. Subjectively, therefore, the extreme malice, inherent in divination as a recourse to infernal powers, would be absent in most cases. To approach the spirits of those with whom we have familiarly conversed in the flesh seems much less repulsive and formidable. It is this form of divination, called necromancy and consisting in the evocation of the souls of the departed, that has been the more popular. Spiritism is a modern revival of necromancy. They are alike as two peas in a pod and they both come under the same moral condemnation.

We say then that Spiritism is superstitious and, on that account, morally reprehensible. And we take Spiritism at its own evaluation, putting upon it no worse construction than the claims made by its adherents warrant. Now it is a cardinal point of the creed of Spiritists that they are in actual communication with the souls of the dead and that from this source they receive important information concerning conditions of existence in the next world. We are not now concerned with the objective interpretation of Spiritist phenomena, but with the subjective attitude of the Spiritists towards them. Their firm conviction is that the messages which come to them as an answer to their inquiries are derived from discarnate souls. This is equally true of the casual inquirer who consults a Spiritist medium. The avowed purpose in such a case is to be put in touch with dead friends and to learn something about their fate in the next world.

According to the teaching of the Church, the other world is to us a sealed book which is not opened to mortal gaze. Nor does the book of life lie open for human inspection. No means are at our disposal by which we can extort the zealously guarded secrets of the silent beyond. At times God may see fit to make certain disclosures; but this is not done at the bidding of man or in response to idle questionings. All attempts, therefore, to establish communications with those that have passed away from this world are futile and opposed to the Divine will. If we believe in the efficacy of the devices employed to bring the dead into our presence and to induce them to answer our inquiries, we are guilty of gross superstition; for these means are utterly inadequate to obtain the desired effect.

Whatever is expedient for us to know anent the life after death, has been revealed to us by Our Lord Himself. To seek confirmation of His teaching from the disembodied spirits would be impious and derogatory to His dignity. It is useless to approach the souls of the departed in quest of new revelations. God has made ample provision for our instruction by the institution of

the Church. As to the individual fate of our dear ones, faith and hope give us sufficient reassurance. We know that their destiny lies with God and that His dealings with them are merciful. Moreover we can come to their assistance by prayer. Prayer will give us more consolation and comfort than supposed spirit-messages could give us. It is Catholic doctrine, that on our part we can do nothing to invite communications from those that have passed away. That settles the case of Spiritism for us: there is no need for revelations from the beyond nor is there any efficacious means to procure such revelations. Any efforts in this direction are both unavailing and unlawful. Father Palmieri, S. J. sums up the matter in these words: "God, as faith teaches us, does not will that the souls of the departed should be subject to evocation by men nor that the latter at their pleasure should establish intercourse with the former. And He wills this in such a way that evocation of this kind not only is illicit but also inefficacious." Thus Spiritism stands condemned as superstition on the basis of its own claims.

The Church's stand with regard to Spiritism is plain, unequivocal and perfectly consistent. As the guardian of the true religion she cannot tolerate superstition and, therefore, condemns Spiritist practices. She forbids the Faithful to take part in Spiritist seances where intercourse between the living and the dead is said to take place and where alleged spirit-messages are received. Even passive presence at such seances is prohibited, because it encourages superstition, confirms others in their errors, scandalizes the weak and the undiscerning in faith, and involves the danger of religious perversion. Psychic research, which is not identical with Spiritistic experiments, and the scientific investigation of the processes of the subliminal soul-life do not come under this ban. But Spiritistic practices of whatever kind, consultations of Spiritistic mediums or any attempts to get in touch with the spirit world certainly fall under this prohibition. The Church in this case acts as a kind mother; she wishes to protect her children against deception and unscrupulous exploitation. Likewise is she anxious to guard the purity of the Faith, for the content of the pretended spirit communications frequently is in contradiction with revealed truth and subversive of ecclesiastical authority. Reason enough why the Church

should set her face sternly against Spiritism and all that is connected with it. Surely, she would be remiss in her duty if she allowed Spiritist pretensions to mislead the Faithful and to entrap the unwary. The lure of this latest fad is great, and nothing but a categorical prohibition can save the thoughtless and the curious from its fatal attraction. The duty of the Catholic in the matter is unmistakable. The Church is the Divinely accredited teacher of truth. From this fountain the Faithful can draw all truth that is salutary and profitable; they need not go to suspected and tainted sources.

In this argument we have abstracted entirely from the ulterior possibilities that lie behind Spiritism and which are calculated to arouse alarm and serious apprehension. There is a strong presumption that some of the phenomena, apparently inexplicable on the level of natural causation, must be attributed to diabolical agencies. This complicates and aggravates the case against Spiritism. No doubt, the Church has this possibility, if it should not rather be called a probability, in view when she solemnly warns the Faithful against any participation in Spiritist practices, however innocent they may seem to be on the surface. This underlying possibility should give us pause. It is a hazardous thing to open the gates for the infernal hosts. Even a remote danger of this kind should fill us with misgivings and deter us from tampering with the unseen world. We do not know who the guests are that we invite. They may be such as we have not bargained for. In the light of this possibility, the prohibition of the Church assumes a new significance and an added importance.

Spiritism, from whatever point of view we may consider it, deserves severe condemnation. It involves a hankering after forbidden knowledge; it employs, in the pursuit of this knowledge, unlawful and abortive means; it exposes its adherents to the danger of unsought intercourse with the powers of darkness, for only they will cater to the sinful curiosity of man. Superstition is the enemy of genuine religion. Spiritism is the enemy of Christianity. It is the unlawful counterpart of Divine revelation. It weans men from Christianity and leads them to religious indifference. It deprives the next world of its grandeur and strips death of its terrors, thus diminishing in the heart of man the desire for the things eternal and the salutary fear of God.

Emperors and Education

JOHN C. REVILLE, S. J.

UNTIL the reign of Julian the Apostate, we find no clearly-defined attempt on the part of the Roman State to claim a monopoly of education. Rome was as practical in her educational system as in her military and political rule. We owe to her the division of education into its primary, secondary and higher, or university,

branches now followed practically throughout the whole world. Wisely did this mistress in the art of governing men realize even under autocratic emperors, that the State must keep her hands off the little plot of ground given over to the free action of the parent and the schoolmaster. The Caesars, and in this they were justified,

claimed, as heads of the State, the right to foster education, to encourage it, to supervise it, to exercise certain police functions where the relations of pupils, schoolmasters and municipal communities were concerned. They never claimed for the State, or for themselves the exclusive right of educating the young. When Vespasian ordered the services of an eminent professor like Quintilian to be paid out of the public treasury, he did not usurp functions in opposition to the rights of either parent or public but merely recognized and encouraged in a particular case the merit of a distinguished scholar. When Hadrian founded that "Athenaeum" in whose halls orators, lecturers and poets addressed the people, and Antoninus Pius allowed professors to enjoy special privileges, such as exemption from military laws and onerous taxes, and Marcus Aurelius ordered professors of eloquence to be paid from the public funds, and Alexander Severus founded chairs of music and architecture in Rome, they were within their rights and never attempted a direct and exclusive State control over the child and the school.

Up to the second century of our era, education and the schools were free in Rome. Under the Flavii and the Antonines the State took an unusual interest in this important function, but never reserved it entirely to itself. State and municipal aid was freely given to schools and teachers, and municipal academies were founded. But side by side with these there always stood the private school, the private *ludus*, much the same as Horace had described it more than a hundred years before. Any citizen not disqualified for the task by evident moral or intellectual unfitness might open his classes, and if the State did not see fit to remunerate his services from the public revenues, a stipend was paid him by his private pupils.

Pagan Rome then never attempted a State monopoly of education. Is it not a strange thing that when we first hear of it, we find it proposed, not because it was a good thing in itself, or for the State or for the parent or the child, but because it was a weapon wherewith to terrorize the Christians already growing to power and influence in the State? That monopoly was then what it is now, an attempt to enslave conscience, an instrument of persecution, an effort to force the believer, either to betray his Faith or to degrade him through the inevitable ignorance into which he was driven by the tyranny of his rulers. All this is readily seen when the scope and the purpose of the Julian monopoly of education are understood.

Bad as it was, the Julian edict did not attempt directly to attack the principle of the freedom of education. But it limited education and its blessings to a favored class and prohibited it to the Christians. It was the conception of a treacherous and crafty mind. Of all the strange beings who sat upon the imperial throne, Julian is in character and temperament one of the most complex. In his hatred of Christianity he seems to have been moved

neither by the cruelty of Nero, nor the greed of Domitian, nor the misdirected interest for the security of the Empire which actuated Trajan, nor the coldly intellectual passion for the old pagan religion and philosophy which stirred Marcus Aurelius. His hatred of Christianity and Christians was that of a sectarian, of a bigot who in his pride despises his rivals and considers them beings of an inferior race. It also was that of an apostate. There is no depth of infamy to which such hatred will not descend. Although Christian blood was shed during his reign, Julian did not primarily intend to be a persecutor. He realized that the blood of martyrs had been the seed of Christians. The age of the martyrs, he knew, was past. The sword was no longer to be the main instrument in the destruction of the followers of the "Galilean." If he could reduce them to the rank of intellectual pariahs, or undermine their faith and win them back to the beliefs of paganism, he would accomplish his purpose. Were he able to control the schools and the educational program of the Empire, his scheme would inevitably succeed. Such has been the plan of campaign of the enemies of Catholic education down to the present day.

By a law issued in June, 362, and subsequently reinforced by a specific edict, Julian attempted to upset the traditional policy of both republican and imperial Rome. The new statutes required that the professors and lecturers appointed by the municipal authorities should receive the approval of the Emperor, and that those who were to teach "should thenceforth have their souls imbued with those doctrines only that are in conformity with public sentiment." What these last words meant in the minds of the Apostate was evident. For Julian, says Paul Allard, in his "*Julien l'Apostat*" (Vol. II., p. 357), public sentiment was belief in the divinities of paganism, it was hatred of Christianity, it was a blind intolerance. By trickery and fraud at first, and if these did not succeed, then by violence, he was to impose his will upon his subjects. And he attempted this in spite of the fact that in the Empire, almost one-half of the fathers and mothers of the youth to be educated were Christians, and by that fact were bound in conscience to avoid the schools where Christian masters could no longer teach and from which Christian children were logically debarred. For the teaching and the education were both paganized by law. The Christians were to be either pagans or boors.

Such was the nicely-contrived Julian dilemma. They were to become pagans, for the masters, according to him, must be in sympathy with the ridiculous fables of Greece and Rome, and believe in their cruel, thieving and sensual deities. Illogical conclusion, as if it were necessary to believe in the myths of Homer, or the religious tenets of Sophocles or Horace to teach their literary beauties! Boors, for though in all probability Julian did not formally exclude Christian children from the schools, he knew that they could not and would not attend. He

thus took for himself, he arrogantly said, the arts, eloquence and culture of Greece, and left to the depised Galileans nothing but their ignorance. It is startling to see how the Julian argument has been at work in the mind of every persecutor and enemy of the Catholic Church, and how the same weapons of statecraft and bigotry have been wielded in every country, from Rome and France and Germany down to the United States, where an insidious and dangerous attempt is now made, slowly to bring the education of the child under the autocratic control of the State. The death of the Apostate a few months after the decrees had been issued broke his fine-spun web of hypocrisy and hatred, and restored the time-honored educational standard to which Rome had so long adhered. The Julian edicts were formally withdrawn in 364 by Valentinian and a few years after by Gratian. Error and injustice do not build for the ages. In 425 we find a momentary effort on the part of the State then governed by Theodosius II, to gain the control of education. But there was question of higher and special studies only. For the first time in history perhaps, we see at Constantinople the appearance of a State university in the modern meaning of the term, with a government-appointed staff of thirty-one professors in various branches. It had all the elements of a State-monopoly of education with its normal corollary, suspension of the right of the individual to open schools, the only privilege in that matter left to him, that of teaching in private families. But the monopoly was local, justified in some measure by the conditions of the eastern capital of the Empire and it did not affect the educational freedom of the rest of the Roman world, where the old standards still prevailed.

These standards prevailed in spite of the inroads of the barbarian hordes in the fourth and fifth centuries, when the State, too busy fighting Vandal and Hun, had little leisure to attend to educational problems. Whatever learning and teaching there was to be found in the world was the result of private initiative in school and monastery, as at Yarrow, Whitby, Lindisfarne, at Bangor, Lerins and Luxeuil, at St. Gall and Monte Cassino. If Charlemagne splendidly fostered education in the School of the Palace, encouraged Alcuin and Eginhart, and saw that every cathedral and monastery should as far as possible build a school near its walls, if Alfred in Wessex followed his example, they were too wise as rulers to claim for the State a privilege and a right which would have taken from the individual all educational initiative. As a result of this educational freedom, they prepared the way for the intellectual splendors of the Middle Ages.

The Middle Ages were the days of education untrammelled. With one exception, it never dawned upon the mind either of Pope or emperor, to bind education as a slave to their authority. The outstanding fact in education during that period is the foundation and the growth of the universities. Before the Reformation eighty-one of these centers of learning were scattered over Europe.

Of these thirteen received no charter either from people, prince or Pope. They were the outgrowth of the times and the needs of the men around them. Whenever there was a Roscellinus, an Abelard or a William of Champeaux, there gathered around him a band of scholars and of eager listeners who thus formed the nucleus of the future university. Thirty-three universities had a Papal charter only, fifteen were founded by imperial or royal authority, and twenty had both Papal and imperial sanction in their foundation. But neither the Papacy nor the Empire ever claimed, with the one exception referred to, the exclusive monopoly of this higher education.

There was a dispute as to whether the privilege "*ubique docendi*," of teaching everywhere throughout the Christian world, granted by universities like Paris and Bologna, was restricted in its origin and grant to the Sovereign Pontiff or the Emperor, but there was never any question as to the free and spontaneous growth and development of the university as such, of its rights to teach and of its educational independence. The universities were not the creatures of the Popes or the State. Pope and Emperor might determine certain privileges, they never intended to take from them their inherent right or to make them the peculiar monopoly of Pope or King.

For a moment, in 1224, the Emperor Frederic II, who by some has been regarded as the father of the idea of a State monopoly of education, attempted to establish at Naples a "*studium generale*," where his subjects were to find all they required for the pursuit of knowledge without being obliged to go abroad. He forbade any student of the realm to leave the country, either to learn or to teach, and ordered absent students who belonged to his kingdom of Naples, to return before a given date to the capital, in whose university and there alone, they were to pursue their researches. All this amounted to a complete monopoly and an autocratic control of the avenues to higher learning. And the very thing which we fear now, were the State to gain complete control of education, happened in the days of Frederic. He made his university the tool and instrument of his petty political rancors, and jealousies. He tried to undermine the schools of Lombardy, especially the University of Bologna, by attracting its students to Naples. He then limited the right of matriculation into his University of Naples, to his own subjects of the kingdoms of Naples and Jerusalem and his territories beyond the Alps, and excluded all those who belonged to the Italian cities with which he was at war. Under such a system the University of Naples was not a success. After five years it was closed in 1229, opened in 1234, closed once more and again opened in 1239. Under Frederic himself and the Hohenstauffen it proved a failure and saw its best days only after 1266 when its tottering fortunes were rebuilt by the Princes of the House of Anjou and the Popes.

'Disordered Christianity'

T. B. MORONEY

IN a recent number of the *New Republic*, Mr. Herbert Croly has written a rather severe criticism of "disordered Christianity." The initial reaction of the ordinary Christian to this article is likely to be one of pronounced impatience. During the past few years we have wearied of attacks on Christianity, that seem to be mainly inspired by the desire to vindicate longstanding personal antipathies to organized religion. But Mr. Croly differs from the ordinary run of the hounds of Christianity. He does not oppose principles, but those whose claim it is that they guard the principles. He does not speak of a Christianity that has failed, but of a Christianity that has been forgotten. Though caustic, he is not irreverent. In fact, his concluding sentences have all the enthusiastic tang of revivalist preaching. These are mollifying considerations that may help us to read the writer's reflections with more patience and, perhaps, a little sympathy.

Mr. Croly is convinced, as many others are convinced, of the moral bankruptcy of the Christian nations. "The rescue of the world from the desolation of the war and the redemption of promise of appeasement placed a strain upon the moral and religious resources of the Christian nations which they were not capable of bearing." There has been a steady inclination on the part of civilized nations to disregard Christian principles in the "management of their political and social business" and to place more reliance on force. "The State, as now organized, is essentially the embodiment of power rather than justice." And "the steady expansion of secular knowledge . . . is exercising an ever more complete and irresistible authority over both the conduct and the conscience of mankind" and helping to stabilize a condition where "men glorify the State, cling to it and worship it as a God." The triumph of the absolute State, devoid of moral sanctions, and interpreting power as irresponsible, has been brought about, Mr. Croly thinks, largely because of the inability of the Christian clergy "to resist the ultimate reign of force in human affairs and the ever complete secularization of society."

He is evidently dissatisfied with Protestantism. The clergy today are "impotent to provide any positive and operative alternative to the reign of force" because "the Reformation severed the alliance between knowledge and religion, an alliance essential both to human liberty and religious authority."

Most people will admit nowadays that the drift to subjectivism in philosophy led to that "uncriticized individualism" which, so long as it held sway, prevented anything like constructive knowledge in political, social, and economic concerns. Most people will admit, also, that Protestantism both accentuated and completed subjectivism. The Protestant religion was, at the outset

anyway, enthusiastic, restless under external authority, claiming an inward Divine light as the only norm. Luther had protested, perhaps sincerely, that he wished to return to the primitive, but his followers never fancied that they had anything to learn from the past. The primitive for them meant the unsocial, the unorganized, a passing through one's own experiences from chaos to order, from darkness to light, a process by which the Bible and revelation were renewed in the individual's own efforts, regardless of the larger or greater experiments of any particular age or even of the race itself. The primary consideration for the Protestant was not intellectual attitudes, but will attitudes by which he was to assert and prove moral interests on his own initiative.

Moral knowledge is no doubt an important part of religious knowledge but it needs the background of reality to make it vigorous and vital. But a mind that is continually identifying God and the world with the looking-glass of its own emotionally moral struggles soon finds itself powerless to grapple with the problems that arise from the material world with all its physical relations and the human world with all its social, political, and economic relations. These latter problems then develop as a body of purely "secular knowledge" and the idea of God becomes associated with a little group of moral experiences, and with a moral knowledge that is vague, shadowy, and aspirational. The whole history of Protestantism is proof of its inability to cope with the actualities of the objective world. It stands for division, separation. It sets God over against the world. It even establishes, as Butler did, a false antagonism in human nature. Nowhere is all this better illustrated than in the unreasoning, puritanical inclination to regard as sinful all things and actions, legitimate in themselves but liable to abuse.

Of course, Protestantism still acknowledges God as the author of the physical laws, the arbiter of the destiny of States, and the Lord of the world, but because of its initial insistence on the subjective side of religion, the great body of its social, political, and economic doctrine has grown weak. Today when a Protestant goes very deeply into sociology, politics, economics, or science he soon becomes what is known as "liberal," which generally means that religion is a minor matter. And the great mass of Protestants console themselves for lost prestige with politicians, professors, and journalists by giving themselves over to the practices of social service.

It should be observed here that Mr. Croly is not more favorable to Catholicism than he is to Protestantism. If he attacks the latter directly, he does so because he appears to be under the impression that the former no longer counts as an important influence. The Reformation did one good thing when it overthrew Catholic

"sacred pseudo-science." Thus, with a wave of the hand, a lift of the eyebrows, and a neat phrase he dismisses the whole system of human conduct and belief, which was thought out on the very principle of union between knowledge and religion, of which Mr. Croly is himself so fond. But the union here was, according to Mr. Croly, all wrong because Catholicism had bound the human mind to "realism."

What is this realism that is so objectionable? It is, so our teachers tell us,

The only theory which renders the individual things of human experience really intelligible, and at the same time keeps the highest and most abstract intellectual speculations in constant and wholesome contact with the concrete, actual world in which we live, move, and have our being.

That ought not to be a bad theory of knowledge. In the event it has not proved itself such. And the proof of more things than puddings is in the eating.

After all, the Catholic Church has a record of definite social achievements. To this Mr. Croly will himself testify, for waxing reminiscent he writes:

There was a time when the Christian Church, as the spokesman of moral and religious interests of mankind, claimed to embody standards of behavior which the State and the property-owner ought to observe in actual practice. It did not, to be sure, have much success in enforcing the claim. But though they never succeeded in bringing about the actual embodiment of Christian standards in political and business behavior, the clergy at least asserted and cherished their own independence of politicians and property-owners and exercised the right to dispose of their own souls.

Perhaps the writer was thinking of a Gregory. Or of a struggle in the time of Bismarck. Or of a later struggle when Cardinal Newman opposed the foremost politicians of his time on such questions as conscience and authority. Lord Acton held to the passionate trust that in the Catholic religion we find a panacea for all social ills, and when the foremost champion of human liberty in modern times speaks thus, lesser men should be respectful.

"Social inefficiency" as applied to the Church by her critics must be interpreted. At present it generally means that the Church refuses to subscribe to some theory of wholesale reform put out by hysterical reconstructionists. The Church acts on the common-sense assumption that a society is elevated in proportion as its individuals are taught to release their capacities in the truest possible manner. To this end her doctrinal system, her Sacramental system, her liturgy are directed. She does not talk sentimental gush about a brotherhood that any working day will disprove. She does not build on any fancied allegiance to a social ideal that a walk in the street can dissipate. She goes to work in a shirt-sleeve fashion in the business of awakening men's minds and stimulating their wills. Certainly there is no man who goes to confession under the proper conditions who is not better fitted for his social activities. And if report is true, this is an ideal that our Jewish friends appreciate.

The work of the monastic Orders, the gilds, even with all their shortcomings, the political theories that took liberty for their foundation, the extensive missionary movements, the Orders of Knighthood, the Crusades, artistic achievements directly under religious inspiration, and the whole fruitage of the Middle Ages are indications of that philosophy, wholesome and effective, which the Church struggles to apply to secular life. It is a philosophy that takes into account the very lowest strata of society and acknowledges no norms but those of real worth. It interprets human liberty in the sense that every individual be permitted to rise to the level of his ability, whether this be making a living or seeking an office.

Nor need the Church be any the less effective in a democratic age. Democracy is defined as the "definite rise of the average man as an important factor in civilization." Evidently democracy is not an affair of votes, or charters, or of reforms by which the masses are presumably swept into happiness and prosperity. It is a spiritual force, intelligible only in terms of individual effort, individual desire, individual achievement, and individual betterment. It is not intended to equalize men but to equalize opportunity. If men are to be in a position to utilize opportunities they must first learn to appreciate themselves and their possibilities. Democracy is at the mercy of every man. No government regulation, no political or economic machinery can bring about a condition that depends essentially for its realization on the responsibility that individuals will bring to their social activities. And the Church is well constituted for this work of personal appeal.

The United States and the Irish Republic

WILLIAM J. M. A. MALONEY, M. D.

COMPLETE and perfect sovereignty, when successfully established in right and in fact, admits the claimant State as an equal among the nations of the world, conferring the privileges and imposing the obligations inherent to membership in the family of nations. The Power against which such a claim is asserted is obviously debarred in justice from deciding its validity. The claim in its nature raises a purely international issue. Only neutral nations are competent to pass upon it: and to their judgment, on January 21, 1919, the Irish Republic submitted the claim of the Irish nation.

The claim of the Irish Republic denied all English rights in Ireland and summoned England to establish or to renounce her pretensions there, before the nations of the world. England through her official propagandists made in effect two answers. In the first, alternately rattling her saber, and pleading privilege as the savior of the world, England affirmed: "The Irish right to independence is limited by the rights and interests of the English nation. The security of England requires the retention of Ireland." This British principle was first

denied by the American Revolutionists in 1776, in so far as it then applied to America; and was finally denied by the United States and its associates in the war of 1917, in so far as it applied to the rest of the world. It violated the spirit of justice and equality before the law, and no civilized tribunal could give it sanction.

In the second answer, England asserted:

The Irish seek only partial control of their affairs, a concession which England as the sovereign Power in Ireland, can alone grant or withhold, and which the British Parliament is even deliberating. The Irish claim raises no international question, and neutral nations have no jurisdiction over it. It is an English domestic issue.

In 1778, England protested to France that the sovereignty of the United States was an English domestic issue. Spain protested to the United States that the South American Republics were a Spanish domestic issue. Turkey similarly protested when her subject States asserted their independence. It is a conventional protest made to neutrals by all imperial Powers when menaced with the loss of sovereignty over people struggling to be free.

In judging the nature of the Irish claim to sovereignty, only its assertion by Ireland and not its interpretation or denial by England can be considered relevant. England's purpose in alleging the domestic issue is solely to deter neutrals from action. Obviously, there is no declaration of warlike intent on the part of a neutral, in the exercise of its legitimate and obligatory judicial function as a member of the family of nations. But the imperial Power against which a judgment is entered may appeal it to the sword. And if the subject nation should then compromise its claim, the neutral might be left to sustain alone a war without a cause. Confronted with the domestic-issue protest, weak nations, therefore, tend to refrain from action. And strong nations feel constrained to wait till they are convinced that the nature of the claim compels them to pass upon it.

From the writings of the Count de Vergennes and from Maurépas' evidence presented by Doniol (*"Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Etablissement des Etats Unis d'Amérique,"* Vol. I, p. 284), it is established that the French Government delayed the recognition of the United States until they were assured of the fixed determination of the American Revolutionists to assert the complete sovereignty they had proclaimed in the Declaration of American Independence. This policy of France, towards the Revolution of 1776, was pursued by the United States in the South American revolutions against Spain. When the Province of Buenos Ayres sought, through de Forrest, recognition of its independence, the then Secretary of State, Adams, replied, "The reservation (by Buenos Ayres) of an indefinite right to grant hereafter especial favors to Spain for the renunciation of her claims to sovereignty left it uncertain whether the independence of Buenos Ayres would be complete or imperfect" (Adams' Report IV. American State Papers,

173): and the United States therefore refused to pass upon the claim. But in a note to President Monroe, August 24, 1818 ("Writings of Monroe," Mss., Department of State), Adams stated: "If Buenos Ayres . . . would assert its entire independence . . . I should think the time now arrived when its Government might be recognized without a breach of neutrality."

The propriety of delay in these instances, was not deemed inconsistent with unofficial but effective aid in the struggle of the probationary period. At the outbreak of hostilities in America, Silas Deane, evading English vigilance, reached France, where with the sanction of the French Minister of State, with the active co-operation of the French Government, and with a substantial loan from secret official sources, a trading company was formed, under the fictitious name of Hortales and Company, which provided the needed war supplies to the American Revolutionists. "The just and generous treatment which their (the United States) trading ships have received by a free admission into the ports of this country, together with other considerations of respect"

. . . was acknowledged by the Commission on American Independence, as the impelling reason for seeking recognition first from France (Loc. cit. Vol. VI. p. 42, Letter to the Count de Vergennes, dated Paris, 23 December, 1776, and signed B. Franklin, Silas Deane, Arthur Lee). The United States Republic, to prove the fixity of its purpose had to withstand the force of England from July 4, 1776, until February 6, 1778, but not unaided.

In like manner, while awaiting conclusive proof of the nature of the claim of the Spanish colonies, the United States aided them to the extent revealed by President Monroe in a letter to General Jackson (Monroe's Writings, Vol. VI. pp. 128-9):

Our policy here has been to throw the moral weight of the United States in the scale of the colonies. . . Our ports were open to them for every article they wanted, our good offices are extended to them with every power in Europe and with great effect.

According to Goebel ("The Recognition Policy of the United States," New York, 1915, p. 127), at that time, "England was contemplating the restoration of the colonies to Spain on the basis of commercial freedom and colonial government." The United States, however, flatly refused to acquiesce and Monroe insisted "that we partake of no councils whose object is not their (the Spanish colonies') complete independence."

For over one hundred years, the United States has freely granted this aid to every new State that has sought it, unofficially encouraging and supporting, in conformity with American traditions, the struggling aspirants to freedom, and thus hastening the day when official action could properly be taken to add another independent State to the family of free nations.

But circumstances ordained that Ireland should fight her fight alone and grievously handicapped, for many

of Ireland's most gallant sons thought the war against Germany to be the final war for the freedom of the world, and voluntarily went out to fight alongside the French, Belgians and English. Believing that the greater freedom would include the less, more Irish than Japanese, Portuguese, South Africans, and relatively, even than Canadians, fell fighting for the Allied cause (vide the *New Statesman*, London, Nov. 30, 1918). Moreover, the United States, the traditional friend of freedom, by her legitimate preoccupation in her own vital affairs, and by her military necessity of associating unreservedly and unconditionally with England to defeat Germany, was debarred from aiding Ireland. And England, seizing and exploiting the necessity which gave her the temporary grace of American association, concentrated her efforts upon the suppression of the Irish Republic. She conducted here an intensified campaign of calumny against Irish citizens and their cause; diverted troops, tanks and artillery to the reconquest of Ireland, secure in the knowledge that America would fill all gaps on the front in France; and paid, fed, and clothed these troops out of loans voted by Congress to fight Germany. Meanwhile, the citizens of the Irish Republic here, with supreme trust in American justice, waived in greater ratio than any other alien nationals, their right to exemption, pledged their lives for America's security, and confided their cause to her care. And the Provisional and permanent Governments of the Irish Republic, scorning concession or compromise, triumphantly withstood, alone and unaided, every effort that England made to suppress it; and under conditions that attested the unalterable determination of the nation, maintained unimpaired, the claim to perfect and complete sovereignty of the Irish Republic.

The Irish claim, being in accord with the genius and age-long traditions of the Irish people, and having been thus upheld for four mordant years, could be depreciated by neutrals only at the expense of their own nationhood. Even neutrals who might lack the courage to countenance the claim could not in dignity longer deny it. By no standard or pretext could England require any self-respecting neutral to await further evidence of the nature of the claim of the Irish Republic. Because of that claim England had instituted and maintained in Ireland a state of war. In spite of all her armed forces, England had steadily lost executive, administrative, and judicial control in Ireland, until her authority there was limited to the range of her guns. Her prospects of regaining that control had become increasingly hopeless. Further delay would serve only to perpetuate the existing schism in international law and to deepen the breach in the comity of free peoples. The Irish claim urgently required settlement. Legality demanded as a right, humanity as a duty, that neutrals should accept and assert jurisdiction over it. And those who had just been associated in the war for "the freedom of all peoples great and small" were under an especial obligation to the dead

who had died for that cause, to heed and to hear the claim of the Irish Republic.

One month after the armistice, a hearing of the Irish claim was granted by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on the Gallagher Resolution: "Requesting the Commissioners Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the International Peace Conference to present to the said Conference the Right of Ireland to Freedom, Independence and Self-determination."

By this hearing the United States served notice on England that the effrontery of the English "domestic" issue would no longer be tacitly tolerated in the Irish Republic by reputable neutrals who had sent their citizens to slay and be slain for the avowed purpose of ending such domestic issues. The hearing signified the definite acceptance by the United States, of jurisdiction over the Irish claim. And on December 12, 1918, Dr. McCartan, the agent of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic, with other elected representatives of the Irish people, eloquently aided by American sympathizers, stated Ireland's case before the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

To secure the recognition of the Irish Republic, by the United States, the Irish advocates had to establish by American standards both the right of the Irish nation to sovereignty, and the fact of the sovereignty of the Irish Republic.

The United States in principle had ever upheld the sovereign right of the people, but in practice had refused officially to recognize the right unless the fact were also established. Historically, the existence of the fact had been determined by variable standards, according to the actual circumstances of the United States, and to the inherent appeal of the particular claim.

In seeking recognition from France, the United States deduced the fact of American sovereignty mainly from the right. On February 6, 1778, France recognized the independence of the United States, although England was then in military possession and control of American waters, of Long Island and other strategic points, and of vital centers of the life of the American people, such as New York and Philadelphia. Without the intervention of France the fact of the sovereignty of the United States might never have been established. But a people who had forced Burgoyne to surrender in reply to Valley Forge had surely a right to their sovereignty. France, from that right inferred the fact, and recognized the new State.

In its infancy, when its very existence was thought to depend upon its peaceful development, the United States abstained from passing upon the merits of claims to statehood and limited itself to the acknowledgment of the established fact of sovereignty. This policy purchased a precarious peace, but at the cost of surrender by the United States of its highest judicial function as a member of the family of nations. Jefferson bitterly resented it. When revolution swept over Spanish South America,

Clay denounced the non-intervention policy, and advocated recognition of the revolting Spanish colonies. But the Spanish Empire was a member of the Holy Alliance, the Clause X of which guaranteed by all the territorial integrity of each. England was pledged, and Russia was ready to preserve by arms the sovereignty of the Spanish Empire in South America. Monroe, fearful of embroiling the United States in a war against the mighty Alliance, obstinately held to official neutrality; but the American people increasingly resented his inaction; and, in 1822, finally forced Congress to recognize the independence of the struggling South American Republics. The Spanish Minister, Don Joaquin de Anduaga, who in his diplomatic communications habitually referred to the "self-styled" and "pretended" republics, on March 9, 1822 protested:

Buenos Ayres is sunk in complete anarchy, there is no government in Mexico, a military triumph of the rebels is denied and their governments have no stability. Where is the right of the United States to sanction and declare legitimate a rebellion without cause and the event of which is not even decided? (IV. American State Papers, Foreign Relations 845-6, quoted by Goebel, loc. cit.).

Adams in reply blandly asserted: the recognition "is the mere acknowledgment of existing facts."

The day of the non-intervention policy was thus at an end except as a diplomatic fiction. Adams, in a note to President Monroe ("Writings of Monroe," Mss., Dept. of State) as early as Aug. 24, 1818, had fore-shadowed the assumption by the United States of its whole duty to intervene judicially in such international issues. Relative to the South American struggle he then wrote:

There is a stage in such contests when the parties struggling for independence have, as I conceive it, a right to demand its acknowledgment by neutral parties, and when the acknowledgment may be granted without departure from the obligations of neutrality. It is the stage when independence is established as a matter of fact so as to leave the chances of the opposing parties to recover their dominion utterly desperate. The neutral nation must, of course, judge for itself when this stage has arrived.

Don Joaquin de Anduaga's protest shows clearly that, as a neutral judge the United States was neither exacting in the standards by which was determined the fact of the sovereignty of the parties struggling for independence; nor unduly influenced in its judgment by the dissenting opinion of the opposing imperial Power.

On March 11, 1837, the United States Senate resolved:

That the State of Texas having established and maintained an independent government, and it appearing that there is no longer any reasonable prospect of the successful prosecution of the war by Mexico, against the said State, it is expedient and proper and in perfect conformity with the law of nations and with the practice of this Government in like cases, that the independent political existence of said State be acknowledged by the Government of the United States.

And the House of Representatives subsequently passing a like resolution, Texas was recognized. As Spain had protested, Mexico protested, and continued warlike

measures against the new State of Texas. But military possession and control had ceased to be a determining American standard; and the fact of sovereignty was now definitely founded upon the ability of the revolutionists to establish and maintain a separate government.

The United States, as it reached its full stature as a free nation, was thus gradually evolving a new policy of recognition based on the principle on which the Republic itself had been founded, the consent of the governed. As the right of sovereignty was held to reside in the people, logically the fact of sovereignty could be established only by evidence of popular consent freely expressed. Armed force could have no validity. The suffrage of the people could alone establish sovereignty in fact. This fundamentally democratic policy of recognition was first adopted in its completeness by the United States during the presidency of Abraham Lincoln. Secretary of State Seward then enunciated it thus: "The policy of the United States is settled upon the principle that revolution in republican States ought not to be accepted until the people have adopted them by organic law with the solemnities which would seem sufficient to guarantee their stability and permanence." (Seward "Diplomatic Correspondence," Vol. II. p. 630.) Asserting this policy in national affairs, the United States successfully opposed in Europe the recognition of the Confederate Government, which was in complete military control and possession of the South. Applying it to international affairs, Seward wrote to the United States representative in Bolivia: "Hitherto your instructions have been not to recognize any government in Bolivia which was not adopted through the free will and constitutionally expressed voice of the people of that Republic" ("Diplomatic Correspondence," Vol. II. p. 330). In 1883, Iglesias who, with the aid of Chile, had acquired military possession and control in Peru, was denied recognition until his action had been formally ratified by the electorate. Since these days down to the present time the United States have almost invariably required democratic sanction and not military possession as the proof of *de facto* sovereignty. In his first administration, President Wilson refused to recognize the Huerta regime in Mexico, because it was not founded upon popular consent. In his second administration, President Wilson led the United States to vindicate by arms in Europe this established American policy of recognizing the right of a people "to live under a government of its own choice."

The United States was bound by its neutrality to judge the Irish case by the principles governing American polity, as these had been interpreted by the precedents of established American practice in similar cases. The Irish Republic, established by arms on April 24, 1916, was accepted and ratified by the electorate on December 14, 1918. Universal suffrage and proportional representation were an integral part of its Constitution. Cooperation was the basis of its national industrial life. In spite of the British army, it had maintained, extended and

consolidated a separate government that even the British Labor Party's Commission acknowledged to be the actual *de facto* government in the greater part of Ireland. The Irish Republic conformed in every particular to the established standards required for recognition by the United States. In validity and form, in right and in fact, the claim of the Irish Republic to complete and perfect sovereignty was incontrovertibly established according to the principles and precedents of the United States Government. And the decision of the United States was, therefore, justly given in Ireland's favor.

On March 4, 1919, by a vote of 216 to 41, the House of Representatives resolved:

That it is the earnest hope of the Congress of the United States of America, that the Peace Conference now sitting at Paris and passing upon the rights of the various peoples will favorably consider the claims of Ireland to self-determination.

And on June 6, 1919, the Senate, by a vote to which there was only one dissident, resolved:

That the Senate of the United States earnestly request the American Plenipotentiary Commissioners at Versailles to endeavor to secure for Eamon de Valera, Arthur Griffiths and Count George Noble Plunkett, a hearing before the said Peace Conference in order that they may present the cause of Ireland, and resolved further, That the Senate of the United States express its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of its own choice.

Congress had passed upon the claim of the Irish Republic and the judgment of Congress was that the Irish claim was judicable by an international tribunal. Congress "earnestly hoped" that tribunal would assume jurisdiction and favorably consider the claim. But England being the dominating member of that tribunal, the only hope expressed by Congress regarding the peace settlement was silently ignored and no action taken. Whereupon the senior legislative branch of the United States Government, doubtless after due consultation with whatever executive authority then existed in this country, formally requested the United States representatives in Paris, to endeavor to secure a hearing for Ireland's claim. As a direction to those who, in America's name, would sit among the judges in that international tribunal, the Senate expressed its sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people for a government of its own choice. And in the permanent national Government of the Irish Republic, the Senate recognized the Government of the people's choice, by specifically and exclusively naming to present the Irish claim only the three delegates previously selected for that purpose by the Government of the Irish Republic.

The resolution of the House of Representatives differed in wording from that of the Senate, the latter being more specific; such verbal differences are not unusual in like resolutions. It is the substance and not the phrasing of the resolutions, that establishes the identity of their purpose: and the two months which elapsed between the House and the Senate resolutions in no ways disturb their concurrent effect.

In neither resolution was the recognition of the independence of Ireland stated in set terms. Ireland had submitted a claim to freedom, independence, and self-determination; the appropriate committee of the United States Congress had accepted jurisdiction over that claim, had granted a hearing upon it, and had then submitted it through both branches of Congress for favorable consideration to an international tribunal. If the Irish Republic were not entitled to be regarded as a sovereign independent State, no neutral had the right to pass *favorably* upon its claim, and Ireland had no standing before an international tribunal. To request the American plenipotentiaries to endeavor to secure a hearing for the delegates of the Irish Republic before an international tribunal, was equivalent not only to an act of recognition of Ireland's title to definite independence but was equivalent also to an act of intervention with the intent of securing the acknowledgment of that independence before the nations of the world.

There is no specific formula of recognition. France, by concluding a treaty of amity and commerce with the United States recognized implicitly and effectively American independence. The United States has habitually "recognized" by receiving or appointing an envoy, by entering into treaties, or by other act implying the independent existence of the new State. By favorably passing upon the claim of the Irish Republic, and by intervening on its behalf at the Paris tribunal of nations, Congress implicitly and effectively recognized Irish independence.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters as a rule should not exceed six-hundred words

The Problem of Prohibition

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read with interest John S. Cregan's letter in *AMERICA* for February 14 and while I am not in a position to say what Masonry as a body had to do with Prohibition, a good many of my friends who are Masons are bitterly opposed to Prohibition. I am struck with the unanimity with which all Prohibition advocates "play up" the evil of the saloon in justification for their uncompromising advocacy of total Prohibition. To hear them it would appear that the only possible way to eliminate the saloon was to abolish perpetually all liquor.

The fallacy of this contention is perfectly clear to all those who saw the "Permit System" in effect in this and other States a few years ago. This Permit System which was put into effect by a majority of the popular vote of the people absolutely eliminated the saloon, the questionable café and other public drinking places but provided for the dispensing of liquor for medicinal purposes by physicians and pharmacists and for Sacramental purposes to clergymen and in addition provided that every law-abiding citizen of legal age might secure a permit every twenty days for the purchase of a certain specified quantity of liquor for home use only.

Under this system, which was in operation in the State of Washington for eighteen months, the evils brought about by saloons and public drinking places disappeared and everybody was satisfied because there was no infringement upon the personal liberty of the individual.

As to what followed, I have explained in a previous letter how the Anti-Saloon League through their powerfully built up State political organization, lobbied and "railroaded" through our State legislature the "Bone-Dry" act of 1917, which act has been in effect since then and which is so drastic that no physician or pharmacist may purchase, possess or dispense liquors in any form for any purpose whatsoever. How much of the terrible death-toll of the "flu" epidemic of 1918 and again of this winter in this State is due to the impossibility of administering liquor to patients at critical stages of the disease is a matter open to conjecture but it is the opinion of many physicians here that bone-dry Prohibition is directly responsible for a good many of these deaths.

So much for the saloon bogey; there are two fundamental principles diametrically opposed to the theory and practice of Prohibition and I have never heard that they have been met on open ground by any advocates of Prohibition. Their failure to do so probably explains the reason for so strongly playing up the saloon bogey on the one hand and on the other hand for promising wonderfully increased efficiency of workmen, decreased taxation and decreased lawlessness as a result of Prohibition; all of which theories have been permanently exploded after two years of bone-dry Prohibition in this State.

The first of the principles I have reference to is that Prohibition is irreconcilably opposed to the fundamental principles of Christianity and for that matter of Judaism as well. If we accept Prohibition as compatible with Christianity then we must perforce reject the fundamental teachings of Christ, no less.

The second principle is that Prohibition is absolutely opposed, contrary to the letter and spirit of the Constitution of the United States and subsequent amendments thereto prior to the Eighteenth Amendment. In effect, the Eighteenth Amendment if held constitutional by the United States Supreme Court before which body it is now being considered, means the repeal of the basic principles of the original Constitution and the subsequent amendments thereto.

Referring to Mr. Cregan's statement that only two States refused ratification of the Prohibition Amendment, I wish to call attention to the fact that the voters of the States of Maryland, California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, New York, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Vermont, Delaware and Missouri under State-wide referendum all voted "wet" prior to the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment; therefore the legislatures of those States in ratifying the Eighteenth Amendment were acting contrary to the expressed wish of a majority of their constituents. Since the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment by the State of Ohio the voters of that State have voted wet by a majority. In our own State of Washington following ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment by the Legislature, steps were taken to circulate a referendum petition on the same but owing to the numerous technical obstructions which were brought into play by the "drys" in this State, a period of only about fifteen days was allowed in which to prepare, print, circulate and return to the State capitol the referendum petition. As a consequence of the short time allowed the petitions when filed were found to be short of the required number of names. Had the usual time of about three months been allowed for the circulation of these petitions among the people, it may be clearly seen what the result would have been.

What has been done by the legislatures of the various States in ratifying the Eighteenth Amendment is now a matter of history; What the result would be if the question were placed before the people via a national referendum vote is another matter, which in view of the firmly entrenched position of the Anti-Saloon League will probably never be decided.

Seattle.

E. V. GRISWARD.

Was Washington Irish?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In AMERICA for February 28, Dr. Austin O'Malley, writing regarding Washington, states that he may have been a descendant of the Washington who was in Madrid in 1623 as a member of the suite of Prince Charles, afterwards Charles I of England. Mr. Henry F. Waters in his "An Examination of the English Ancestry of George Washington," on page 19, writes as follows:

In 1623 Sir Edmund Verney visited Madrid with other officers and gentlemen of the Prince's household, Prince Charles and Buckingham having already preceded them on that romantic expedition, undertaken for the purpose of seeing the Spanish *infanta*. In the service of the Prince, as a page, was a Mr. Thomas Washington, whom Colonel Chester satisfactorily identified as the sixth son of Lawrence Washington of Sulgrave and Brington, Lawrence, husband of Amphilis, being the fifth.

The following extract from "Familiar Letters on Important Subjects wrote from the year 1628 to 1650 by James Howell, Esq., Clerk of the Privy Council to King Charles 1st" (tenth edition, Aberdeen, 1713), becomes of interest to us. The letter was dated Madrid, August 15, 1623:

"Mr. Washington, the Prince's Page, is lately dead of a calenture and I was at his burial under a fig-tree behind my Lord of Bristol's house. A little before his death one Ballard an English Priest went to tamper with him: and Sir Edward Varney meeting him coming down the stairs of Washington's chamber, they fell from words to blows but they were parted. The business was like to gather very ill blood and come to a great height, had not Count Gondoman quasht it."

This would seem to dispose of Mr. O'Malley's suggestion, and I regret to have to say that a careful reading of Mr. Waters' article will pretty nearly convince one that the forbear of our great General came from Sulgrave manor. The genealogical table shows a John Washington (wife, Ann Pope) coming to Virginia in 1633; one of their children, Lawrence (wife, Mildred Warren) was the father of Augustin, who married Mary Ball (mother and father of George).

As to Mary Ball being born in Antrim, Ireland. I wonder where Dr. O'Malley finds authority for this very flat statement. Ella Bassett Washington has written a very interesting story on the mother and birthplace of Washington. She states that Mary Ball was the daughter of Colonel Joseph Ball of Epping Forest, Lancaster County, Va.; born there in 1706. Her grandfather, Colonel William Ball, came here in 1657, a British Royalist. Her father's will mentions her and she married Augustin, March 6, 1730. She was known as the Rose of Epping Forest. As she did not die until 1789, and the General often visited her, the place of her nativity ought to be easily established. She blessed Lafayette on his visit to bid her good-by, in a most affecting scene.

May I say that it gives me no pleasure to question Dr. O'Malley's statements and I hope he can prove his case, but the Irish have such a glorious and incontrovertible record of distinguished sons the world over, there is no need to make any claim for one more, if the claim is open, to say the very least, to doubt.

Boston.

JOSEPH C. PELLETIER.

The Duty of Vigilance

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The editorial in a recent issue of AMERICA, "May Congress Now Ban the Mass," setting forth the firm stand that every priest will take, in case any law, "which clearly infringes upon his rights and duties as a minister of Christ," becomes operative, should be an inspiration to our Catholic people throughout the land. We must be vigilant to detect and protest against legislation that would "strike down the hands of the priest as he raises to God the Blood of Christ, pleading pardon for a stricken world."

Brooklyn.

ROSALIND X. SHIELD.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1920

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

Published weekly by The America Press, New York.
President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSLEIN;
Treasurer, CHARLES J. DEANE.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 173 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Class Representation

A REVEREND Anti-Saloon League leader in the West has "served notice," to adopt his own phrase, that the lips that touch liquor, or are inclined to touch it, can never win his vote. And thereupon he calls on all his followers to vote against any man who does not believe that the Eighteenth Amendment is immutable. A charming hostess, President of a Suffragist League in New York, invites her followers to defeat for re-election one of New York's Senators, on the ground that he argued against the proposed Nineteenth Amendment, and this despite the double fact that women in New York already have the vote, and that the rejection of the Nineteenth Amendment is highly improbable. Finally, a labor leader in the East likewise "serves notice" that no man shall be sent to Congress unless he is "friendly" to labor unions.

It is a poor American who is not "friendly" to labor, but there are some Americans who hold that this friendship does not consist in subservience to the demands of some union or group of unions. So, too, there may be some Americans who are persuaded that public office is first of all a public trust, and that the brief authority conferred upon them by the ballot is to be exercised for the good of all the people, and not for the advantage of a particular class. The more closely the claims of candidates for office are examined, the better will the claims of the public be protected. When honest men are too busy with private affairs to fulfil their duties as voters, the reign of the political rascal is secure. But this scrutiny must not be one-sided. A candidate who appeals to one class only, may be an honest man, but his qualifications for office are to be suspected. His intentions may be good, but the chances are that he will show himself not the representative of the people, but of a class.

It was supposed in the old days that we had done away with class distinctions in this country. Perhaps the supposition was founded on hope rather than on truth. It is not true, surely, when we elect men on a class-platform, tie them to a class-creed, and then think we have done a

patriotic thing. At the conclusion of a Lincoln Day address in an Eastern university, the speaker was greeted by a prominent citizen with the comment, "Well, I suppose that talk about the rule of, for, and by the people, is true in theory, but in practice it's largely 'bunk'." It is largely, if not entirely, "bunk" when sovereign voters are content to cast the ballot for men who represent the Anti-Saloon League or the Workingman's Alliance rather than the people of their communities and the principles of American constitutional government.

Catholic Girls in Non-Catholic Schools

THE district attorney in New York recently announced that in order to know that dirt existed, it was not necessary to explore the city sewers. Rather obvious was the remark, but it was needed, for it was addressed to the professor of sociology in a college for young women. This pundit had decided that a complete course in social science required the presence of these young girls in a court room, during the examination of criminals of a peculiarly low and revolting kind. The district attorney did not concur in this decision. He could not prevent their presence, since, as yet, there are no Star Chamber trials in this country. But he would do nothing to encourage them, and if he had any "special facilities" for the study of crime, he intended to reserve them for students of maturer mind and training.

This action aroused the hostility not only of the professor, but of the sensational press. That, however, was to be expected, but somewhat unexpected was the comment of a New York policeman. It cannot be literally transcribed, for it was delivered in a kind of dialect, but its general sense was, "What can mothers be thinking of when they send their girls to a college which requires a first-hand acquaintance with vice?" It is highly probable that some of these girls were the children of Catholic mothers, for this college, which has a reputation for "fashion" although not for scholarship, has attracted the attention of many a "climbing" Catholic. But what can any mother "be thinking of" when she sends her daughter to any non-Catholic college?

Perhaps it is easier to answer what she is not thinking of. She is not thinking of the fact that at the best of non-Catholic colleges her daughter is subjected to subtle and appealing non-Catholic and anti-Catholic influences, tending to weaken faith and morality; or that in the ordinary course of study, her daughter will be obliged to read books condemned by the Church, or banned by the natural law, as contrary to faith and morals; or that frequently she will listen to teachers to whom supernatural religion is at best but a harmless sentiment, and to whom morality is a matter of doing what most appeals, provided you can escape the censure of law or convention. Last of all, she is not thinking of the indubitable truth that at the great day of judgment, God will require at her hands the soul of this child.

"It must needs be that scandals come, but woe to that

man by whom scandal cometh," and a double portion of wo to the mother who thus exposes her daughter. That transgression is not only scandal. It is unnatural sin, for by the very law of nature, a mother is strictly bound to protect her child. What, then, can the mother allege in excuse, who has actually exposed her daughter to loss of faith and morality? Fashion? The custom? Her social station? Better for her that she had never been born.

The Church and the Penitent

"MOST significant and thought-compelling" is what the editor of the *American Church Monthly*, the High Anglican magazine, well terms the following "parable" from André Maurois's *Les Silences du Colonel Bramble*:

"O'Grady, you are an Irishman, tell me why the Catholic chaplains have more prestige than ours." "Padre," said the doctor, "listen to a parable; it is your turn. A gentleman had killed a man. He was not suspected, but remorse caused him to wander abroad. One day, as he passed an Anglican church, it seemed to him that he must share his burdensome secret, and asked the vicar to hear his confession. The vicar was a well-educated young man, a former student of Eton and Oxford. Enchanted at the rare opportunity, he cried eagerly. 'Certainly, open your heart, you can speak to me as a father.' The other began: 'I have committed murder.' The vicar jumped up. 'You tell me that! Wretched murderer! I am not sure that it is not my duty to take you to the nearest police-station. At any rate, it is my duty as a gentleman not to keep you a minute more under my roof!' The man went his way. Some kilometers further he saw a Catholic church. A last hope caused him to enter, and he knelt behind some old women who were waiting near a confessional. When his turn came he saw in the shadow a priest praying, head on hands. 'My father,' said he, 'I am not a Catholic, but I would like to confess to you.' 'I am listening, my son.' 'Father, I have committed murder.' He waited for the effect. The priest said gently, 'How often, my son?'"

The doctor's little parable shows as well as could an hour's learned exposition the Church's attitude toward the sinner. Her high mission is to hallow her children and lead them to Heaven by changing sinners into penitents. So her confessors, though they have of course been trained always to act in the sacred tribunal like skilful physicians, prudent counselors and just judges, fully realize that they must be, above all else, kind and patient fathers. They have learned from the example of the Good Shepherd Himself that every lawful means should be used to keep the sinner from going away unrepentant and unabsolved. Therefore, the confessor never seems to be surprised or scandalized at anything he hears and with a hundred holy artifices encourages faltering penitents to cleanse their bosoms thoroughly from the perilous stuff that is ruining their soul's health. Encompassed with infirmity himself, he can feel for those who have been vanquished for a time in the never-ending battle they must wage with Satan, the world and the flesh. So he bends down, tenderly helps his penitents to rise, pours into their wounds oil and wine, and starts them forward again, heartened and rejoicing, on their way to Heaven.

The Cost of Living

MATHEMATICIANS may find much professional pleasure in figuring the tax-assessments for next year. Heads of families will do even a greater amount of figuring, but not with the same degree of pleasure. For they not only calculate the bill, but pay it, and for the next few years the bill will be frightfully large. Every family in the United States will pay about \$550 next year to defray the expenses of the Federal Government. What further taxation he will be obliged to meet, depends upon his State and city, but nowhere will he escape a bill smaller than \$550. For June, 1920-1921, the budget of the State of New York will be about \$110,000,000. Assuming that there are 2,500,000 families in the State, the State family tax calls for \$44. Then the city steps in to take what is left. The budget for the city of New York is \$280,000,000. On the assumption that there are 1,250,000 families in the city, the city family tax-rate will be \$224. Total for a family living in the city of New York, \$818, a sum which within recent years was held to be a fair living wage for a man, his wife, and three children. Today the tax-rate about equals the living wage of ten years ago. Figures express better than words the impossible economic conditions of the day.

A high tax-rate means a high cost of living, and as the Secretary of the Treasury recently reported, one of the most potent causes of this high cost is the Government's reckless expenditures of public money. Perhaps if every citizen realized that it is his money that the Government is squandering, these "reckless expenditures" would cease with a suddenness unparalleled in history. The Government does not get its money by digging it out of the ground, or picking it from a tree. What money it has, it has dug out of the citizen's pocket, or has picked from his bank account. That his pocket is now empty, or that he has no bank account, makes no difference. A tax is always passed on to the ultimate consumer. He pays more for a loaf of bread, a pound of potatoes, a pair of shoes, a coat for his back, a roof to shelter his family. When the Federal Government finds itself obliged to tax everything in sight, and a good many things not in sight, what can the poor butcher and baker and candlestick-maker, not forgetting the tailor and the landlord do, except raise the price? And that is what he does. He always runs true to form. The Government oppressing him, he can do no otherwise.

But it is not the fault of the Government. Back of all foolish and expensive legislation is Congress, and when men like Senator Kenyon can introduce bills for the Federal relief "of a bum that falls off from a railroad train while stealing a ride," it is time to consider whether men with some elementary knowledge of the Constitution cannot be chosen to serve at Washington. There are many such bills now before Congress. One of them is the Smith-Towner bill. If you are anxious, first, to pay an increased Federal tax next year, secondly, to in-

sure a rapidly increasing Federal tax bill for the rest of your tax-ridden life, and thirdly, to see your money wasted on the support of politicians at the expense of the schools, give your Congressman and Senators no rest

until you have their pledge to vote for the Smith bill. If you are not eaten up with this anxiety, but, on the contrary, are worrying about the rent and your half-soled shoes, ask them to kill it beyond all resurrection.

Literature

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING

FRANCIS THOMPSON has said, "To be the poet of the return to nature is somewhat; but I would be the poet of the return to God." Mrs. Browning is a poet of that ilk: outside the body of the Church, she loved the Master of the Church with a love deep and strong which drew her closer to Him than the mere touching of the hem of His garment.

The close of a splendid poetical period had come, and another period of greatness was arising; and three figures stood prominently out; Alfred Tennyson, Robert Browning, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning. With the two men-poets our woman-poet must be classed for greatness, nobility, force, and all that goes up to make that wonderful thing, poetry, which it is so hard to define, yet whose presence is straightway felt and by whose absence it is known Mrs. Browning was essentially a lyric poet. Her best and ripest work appears to the present writer to be, in the first instance, the great love-sonnets "From the Portuguese," a heading now too well understood to be here explained. As we know, the sonnet-form presents the peculiar doubles of difficulty and ease; of straitness and breadth; of bonds that are a finer liberty. Her life has saturated them; they beat with her heart. To speak of them is to go back to their source and inspiration, the exquisite love-story that is now a part of the history of English literature:

How do I love thee? Let me count the ways.
I love thee to the depth and breath and height
My soul can reach, when feeling out of sight
For the ends of Being and ideal Grace.
I love thee to the level of everyday's
Most quiet need, by sun and candlelight.
I love thee freely, as men strive for Right;
I love thee purely, as they turn from Praise.
I love thee with the passion put to use
In my old griefs, and with my childhood's faith.
I love thee with a love I seemed to lose
With my lost saints—I love thee with the breath,
Smiles, tears, of all my life:—and, if God choose,
I shall but love thee better after death.

After the sonnets, in poetic rank, we should place the poems that are full of the passion of motherhood, the fervor of pity, and the love of nature. Her instrument is not one of a few strings only; and the strings respond to the love of man and, through all, to the love of God. Poem after poem could be named, as poem, not simply as verse: her out-pouring is that of the natural poet, not of the cultured woman who could write well; and yet she was a cultured and a learned woman; her culture never touched by affectation or preciosity, and her learning never degenerating into pedantry. These were her possessions and they gave her a fuller touch, a wider scope, a grander measure. Her rhyme-system, which, on a feebler voice, would, at times jar on the ear, in her singing has its imperfections almost transmuted into beauty by the sheer power and fervor of the lyric cry. It is her own system, deliberately adopted. Her rhyme-roses breathe not of themselves but of her.

In the case of most poets, even the greater ones, Shakespeare always excepted, it is often possible to trace, in some measure, the spiritual ancestry. It would be more than difficult to do this in the case of Mrs. Browning. The subjects of the early poems, "The Seraphim and the Drama of Exile," suggest Miltonic influence; and the form is often touched with the sublimity

which we denote under the epithet *Miltonic*. But there is none of that imitation which would at once forbid the application of that epithet to the younger poet. She was, from her early days, saturated with poetry, great poetry, English, Greek and the largeness of her taste made for her the following of any "master" impossible.

Probably Mrs. Browning considered "Aurora Leigh" her best work, as in size and scope it would seem to be the most "important." But with all its nobility of conception and thought, its passages of fine beauty, some deserving the name of august, its lyric loveliness, its charm of description, its warm humanity and high purpose, we can rather think of it for the glories of its wonderful purple patches than for its poetic greatness as a whole. It is easy to say where the book fails, as all must do when an author attempts to portray things and phases of which he or she knows nothing. The part that deals with Lady Walde-mar and with what its author imagined to be the society of "St. James's" and the inhabitants of "St. Giles's" is detestable, and detestable in a way other than our poet meant it to be. We would gladly expunge these and some other parts of the poem, and keep the patches that are purple with a splendor beyond that of the Tyrian dye. They are the great things that can come out only of a great mind and a great soul. Here, for instance, does she not reach a great height?

And truly I reiterate, nothing's small.
No lily-muffled hum of a summer bee,
But finds some coupling with the spinning stars;
No pebble at your foot, but proves a sphere;
No chaffinch, but implies the cherubim; . . .
Earth's crammed with heaven,
And every common bush afire with God . . .
There's not a flower of spring
That dies ere June, but vaunts itself allied
By issue and symbol, by significance
And correspondence, to that spirit-world
Outside the limits of our space and time,
Whereto we are bound. Let poets give it voice
With human meanings. . . .

Mrs. Browning was very conscious of the "mission" of the poet, and gave, as it seems, over-expression to this consciousness. "The Vision of Poets," one of her longest poems, is full of it; beautiful as it is, in various ways, it is yet marred by what is not only exaggeration but morbidity. The line in "Cowper's Grave" "He shall be strong to sanctify the poet's high vocation," is worth much of the fine spilt of description in the longer poem. Her view of the poet, at least in her earlier writing, is not only of one called to much suffering but, by his calling separated from mankind. Her contact with one poet so thoroughly healthy and free from pose as her husband should have taught her to throw away this creed, but in a much later, and, in condensation and control of emotion, much finer poem, "A Musical Instrument," published after she had been for some time a happy wife and mother, we find this morbidity also. The reed cut from the bed of the river, and shaped by the God Pan, and blown into by his breath for the making of music piercing the blinding in its sweetness, can grow no more as a reed with the reeds in the river; and so it is when a poet is made out of a man.

Deliver us from meeting one of her poets in ordinary life. What would this poet have said could she have known of the

young rhymers of our day, who wear their gift "lightly, as the fruit That in our winter woodland seems a flower?" The belief in the pedestaled poet of isolation is a heresy, only less harmful than the heresy that takes the bit and the bridle from the possessor of gifts special in the number or their weight or their proportion, and allows to "genius" the right to be free from the obligations which we call moral. Happily Mrs. Browning was not at all like her typical poet. She was fine in all the relations of life; as daughter, sister, wife, mother and friend.

This poet was a brave woman as well as a good woman and a great poet. For many years she was an invalid and one who suffered much, and through all those years she went on working as well as loving. Much sorrow too was her portion. Her healing joy came to her very late; her matin bell rang at the time of vespers. It brought her a great joy and a wonderful healing, and she praised God therefor.

Mrs. Browning loved Italy with a fervid and passionate love. The old classic Italy, she tells she heard "crying through her life, Thou piercing silence of ecstatic graves, Men call that name." And with modern Italy, in her struggle to shake off the Austrian yoke, her sympathy was intense. In this connection it is worth while to quote a few words of hers written about eighteen months before she died; words which throw light on her as a great and noble woman: "Whatever small worth may be in me . . . arises exactly from the earnestness and thoroughness of thought and feeling upon subjects which don't personally touch me." This was the woman of whom Lord Leighton said, as his sister told me, "She was the most unselfish person I ever knew."

Defects in her work? Yes, there are sometimes these: occasional failure in technique, but a failure speedily caught up on the wings of a fine inspiration, now and then a failure in taste, condoned, if not redeemed, by the fervor of feeling and its truth. But when all has been granted this too must be said. Surely Urania had taken her by the hand; had stooped down and kissed her lips, and left upon them inspiration and benediction.

EMILY HICKEY.

OUR LADY OF THE RAIN

Dear Lady, when the noon is grey
And wistful showers wet the hills,
When pallid are the cheeks of day
And weaving mist the distance fills,
When desolate the woodland lies,
The drear and sunless air is pain,
Then unto thee I turn mine eyes
And hail thee, Lady of the Rain!

There is such sunlight in the thought
Even the fleeting thought, of thee,
That all the dreary world is brought
Under a cheerful witchery.
The air is sweeter and the reek
Of meadows hath a wet delight.
Thy name can make the storm-clouds meek,
And break with beams their mimic night.
When on our weary spirits pour
The dropping tears in dull refrain
Then let us call, and grieve no more,
On thee, dear Lady of the Rain!

EDWARD F. GARESCHÉ, S. J.

REVIEWS

An Irishman Looks at His World. By GEORGE A. BIRMINGHAM. New York: George H. Doran, \$2.00.

Canon Hannay, the author of this pleasant book of essays, is a witty Belfast Anglican who prefers to live in Dublin. A

shrewd observer of Irish life and character and remarkably free from Ulsterian rancor, he gives in a dozen very readable chapters his impressions of Ireland today. Politics, education, religion, the farmer, the aristocracy, the middle classes, all of which are elements in the "Irish problem," are discussed in a genial, conciliating way that is highly refreshing. The author freely admits that the Ulster Unionists, though a small minority in Ireland, "have succeeded up to the present moment in imposing their will upon the rest of Ireland." It is the "acute explosive Protestantism of North-East Ulster present in all classes, coloring the imperialism of the aristocracy, spiritualizing the business instincts of the manufacturer," and it should be added, governing the policy of the dominant party in England, that is the chief barrier in the path of Irish independence today. Then, describing the rise and spread of the new Nationalist party, Canon Hannay writes:

Sinn Fein, steadily professing deep respect for spiritual authority, went its own way. The Government proved curiously helpless. It threatened and hesitated to fulfil its threats. It imprisoned men without accusing or trying them and then let them out again still unaccused and still untried. It talked with tremendous emphasis about a German plot, and then, though Ireland might perhaps have disliked the presence of such a monster in the country, produced no evidence whatever that the beast existed, not a nail from its claw, not a tooth, not a hair, did not even point to a foot-step in the sand. Sinn Fein scoffed openly and Ireland laughed a bitter little laugh. Conscription was threatened, was postponed and the threat in the end abandoned. That threat did all that was still necessary to establish the power of Sinn Fein in Ireland.

In the chapter on "Ireland's Religion" the author seems to claim for his little alien sect characteristics that properly belong only to Ireland's Catholicism, and he actually holds that the ancient Church of Ireland was "neither Catholic nor Protestant." Particularly interesting and illuminating are the concluding chapters of Canon Hannay's book in which he tells what makes Dublin Dublin and why Belfast is more admirable than amiable. He maintains that the Irish people "do not in fact drink more than any one else," but bitter snobbishness and intellectual apathy, in the author's opinion, are the two evils of Irish village-life. W. D.

Science and Morals and other Essays. By Sir BERTRAM C. A. WINDLE, M. A., M. D., Sc.D., London: Burns & Oates.

This work is another of the series of excellent volumes the author has contributed on the important question of science in its relation to religion. Such subjects as the "theophobia of scientists," an expression coined by Father Wasmann, S.J., "Science in 'Bondage,'" "Heredity and 'Arrangement,'" "Special Creation," "Science and the War," and kindred themes are discussed with logical clearness and not without a certain sense of humor that adds a zest to the book. Particularly interesting to the average reader may be Sir Bertram's essay on the cause of the atheism and agnosticism of many of the English scientists. He believes that the repugnance shown by them to religion in the nineteenth century was mainly a reaction against the unnatural Evangelicalism, and especially the terrible variety known as Calvinism, which represented it in the early portion of that period. In illustration he discusses the prevailing forms of Protestantism as they are found exemplified in the leading novelists of the time, and narrates his own experience when as a boy he was left alone for a moment with a person of some distinction who had been a *viveur* in his youth, but later embraced a most ferocious type of Evangelical religion:

No sooner was the room empty than he peremptorily demanded of me whether I was saved. On hearing my trembling but perfectly truthful reply that I really did not know, he struck the table with his fist (I can see the whole thing quite plainly today, though it is five-and-forty years

ago) exclaiming, "Then you are a fool, and if you were to die tonight you most certainly would be damned."

It was such religion that set Cowper mad and made atheists of countless others. The reaction in turn against the irrational materialism into which many fell is the equally irrational occultism we are now witnessing.

J. H.

History of Religions. By GEORGE FOOT MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Litt. D. II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. New York. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00.

Seeing that the author of this book is a Doctor of Divinity, we may assume that he is a clergyman of some kind. Consequently it is certain that he says his prayers. Were curiosity allowable, we would be curious to know what God he addresses himself to. On page 4 of his work we meet one we have met before in books of this nature. Jehovah, the god of Israel—with a small g, "not a native of Canaan," but with his seat on some mountain to the south. On page 7, he enjoys from his people of Israel a common worship with the more peaceful gods of the Canaanites, with whom he divides the functions of divinity in a most friendly way, he taking charge of the departments of war and cattle raising, while they attend to the department of agriculture. On page 14 he is promoted, and becomes God with a big G, unless indeed this be another who has supplanted the original god of war and herds. Still he is only national. But on page 30, not by virtue of his own intrinsic perfection, but through the workings of the Jewish mind, he becomes the sole God of the human race, promising salvation and restitution, and his prophets, formerly differing from other men only in their gift of second sight, are now inspired messengers to the nations carrying light and salvation to the ends of the earth. So much for Judaism.

It is not necessary to proceed in this analysis; as it is obvious how, in the discussion of Christianity, neatly sandwiched between Judaism and Mohammedanism, Our Lord Jesus Christ will be treated by one who apparently professes to be His minister and servant. Let us come back to our question; which after all, is not one of mere curiosity, since it touches very closely many today: to what God does the author direct his daily prayers? Is it the warrior, herdsman god, "not a native of Canaan;" or the National Hebrew God with the big G; or the result of Jewish ratiocination, the God of salvation for all mankind; or is it the triune Christian God and Jesus Christ the Word Incarnate? Are all these one and the same God, or are they different beings? If the latter what was the God of salvation for all doing, while the herdsman and warrior god, "not a native of Canaan," was usurping his place? Was he, to use the words of Elias, asleep or on a journey? Or are they all mere idea, and their diversity nothing but the expression of the evolution of that idea? We cannot say how Dr. Moore would answer these questions, though, from certain modes of expression he uses, we can conjecture. But we do know that the foundation of all this so-called science of religion, with its historical method working on data utterly insufficient for such use, is the idealism of Kant and his followers; and that its logical result is that of the false philosophy on which it rests, that for man God is but the expression of an idea, and that religious systems are but that idea's evolution. Whether there be any reality that can be called God, is for such men, something unknowable; but what they are sure of is, that their idea neither begins with, nor terminates at, nor is in any way connected with such a being. To this, one must come, who commits himself to what Dr. Moore and his fellows would persuade us is history of religions. Were we so unhappy as to be brought within the danger of this scientific frame of mind, we should be compelled to a definite choice between our prayers and the drivellings of Kantian research; and with the grace of God, our one, true, personal, triune God, revealed in the Incarnate Word, not a god spun out of our intestinal disturbances,

we humbly hope our choice would be well made. For the rest, no soul need be disturbed by any act of scientific accuracy in books such as this. A grain of fact, a pound of assumption, and any amount of borrowed prejudice, and a general ignoring of what does not fit in with a theory assumed for extrinsic reasons, are not the elements of real science, the knowledge of things by means of their causes.

H. W.

Le Dieu Vivant; La Révélation de la Sainte Trinité dans le Nouveau Testament. Par JULES LEBRETON. Paris: Beauchesne. 3 fr.

Father Lebreton, Professor of the History of Christian Origins, at the Catholic Institute of Paris, has made of the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, what may well be termed a life-long study. To his learned "Origins of the Dogma of the Trinity" meant principally for the more advanced students of theology, he has recently added a more popular book. But the little volume bears the stamp of the sound critical methods which were used in his preceding work, and everywhere displays the same sureness of Scriptural, patristic and dogmatic research. It is moreover a book to deepen our love of the most exalted mystery of our Faith. In his brief foreword, Father Lebreton admirably says that the sublimest mysteries of our Faith are not a secret reserved for the chosen few and the specially initiated only, they belong to all Christians. For all are children of that God whom all are destined to contemplate in His Divine essence for all eternity. All then must prepare themselves for that vision by faith. The object of that vision will be God Himself, such as He is in His Unity and Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The Son of God, the Second Person of that adorable Trinity came on earth in human form to teach us the secrets of that hidden and majestic life of Father, Son and Holy Ghost. The living and visible Church there, is the manifestation of the splendors of the One and Triune Living God. So He is the Master, the Teacher whose revelation of the central mystery of our Faith Father Lebreton here lovingly studies both in itself and in its subsequent enunciation by its accredited messengers. The author's learned pages not only instruct the mind but warm the heart.

J. C. R.

The Life and Death of King John. A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, Edited by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS, JR., A. B.; Litt. D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, \$6.00.

To those unfamiliar with the Furness Shakespeare, eighteen volumes of which have already been published, the encyclopedic perfection of the book under review must be very impressive. For, following a preface by the erudite editor, comes the complete text of the 1623 folio, typographical errors and all, the greater portion of each page being taken up with variant readings and the remarks of Shakespearean scholars on every word of the play that invites study or discussion. The meaning of Falconbridge's remark "Heeres a Stay," for instance, is examined through four large pages of fine print. Nearly half the 728-page volume is devoted to an appendix in which is given a wealth of learning about the date of "King John's" composition, and the sources of the plot. Then follow "A Letter to Colley Cibber," famous scholars' analyses of the play's characters, renowned actors' interpretations, an account of the play's different versions and a full bibliography. The text of "The Troublesome Raigne," on which Shakespeare based his drama, gives many an interesting indication of the way the great master made use of his sources. Though British statesmen have always been fond of quoting from "King John" the strong anti-Papal passages Shakespeare puts into the mouth of "Lackland," it is a remarkable fact that this very play is brought forward as a strong proof of the author's friendly attitude toward the Catholic Church. In "The Troublesome Raigne" for instance, a play which was written to villify the ancient Faith, is a

scurrilous scene holding monks and nuns up to ridicule. But Shakespeare omits it altogether, though such ribaldry would have pleased, no doubt, most of his audience. A dozen pages of the appendix discuss "Shakespeare and Roman Catholicism," presenting the arguments of both sides. W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The Catholic Mind for March 22 is a strong brief for Catholic education. That portion of the American Bishops' joint pastoral which bears on the subject opens the number, and then follows a remarkable letter which the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. McQuaid sent the Holy Father in 1893, when the parish-school question was such a burning one. The letter is taken from Dr. Zwierlein's sketch of Bishop McQuaid's "Episcopal Career" in the current *Catholic Historical Review* and shows, as subsequent events have proved, how marvelously right the shrewd Bishop was. He wrote:

What we have most of all to dread is not the direct teaching of the State schools, it is the indirect teaching which is the most insidious and the most dangerous. It is the moral atmosphere, the tone of thought permeating these schools that gives cause for alarm. It is the indifferentism with regard to all religious beliefs we most of all fear. This is the dominant heresy that, imbibed in youth, can scarcely ever be eradicated. It is one that already has in our large towns and cities decimated Protestant churches. It is one that will decimate our churches if not checked in time. Indifferentism with regard to all religions ends in rank infidelity. . . . For many years past I have felt that in this country the Catholic school was as necessary for the children as the church was for them and their parents. For although the chief mission of the Church is to preach the Gospel of Christ, yet there is little likelihood of that Gospel reaching and abiding in the hearts of the children except through the instrumentality of the schoolhouse. Indeed it will be useless to build churches that in one or two generations hence will be vacant because children or grandchildren of European parents no longer follow the religion of their ancestors. If the Church in the United States has already lost so many of her children, it is due in large degree to the want of Catholic schools.

The number closes with Bishop Turner's thoughtful paper on "Christian Education."

Among the Liturgical Masses recently published by the Boston Music Co. is N. A. Montani's "*Regina Pacis*" (\$0.60). It is for unison two, three or four-part boys', men's or mixed choirs, and well adapted to singing by schoolchildren or congregations. An English translation is subjoined to the Latin text. The Mass is simple, of easy compass, devotional and distinctive in theme owing to its close association with the Church's own Gregorian melodies. Another is N. J. Elsenheimer's Mass in E-flat (\$0.75), for mixed voices, rather modern in melody and brilliant, somewhat too regular in movement. The Mass is not difficult. Defective printing, especially on pages 33 and 48, should be remedied; the ink penetrates the pages.—Silver, Burdett & Co. have added a supplement, "The Primary Song Book," to the sight-reading songs in "Book One" of their very commendable Progressive Music Series, for the musical education of children. The book is filled with pure melodies from child-land, well printed and carefully arranged for little ones. The words scintillate with nursery sunshine.—A song of the Flag, "Are You For Me, or Against Me?" (Fischer, New York), by Fay Foster, is advertised as the only one of 10,000 entries by women composers included among fifteen prize-winners in the New York *American's* 1919 National Anthem Competition. It is published as solo, unison or part chorus, equal or mixed voices, and is a stirring number for patriotic gatherings, but the words are on too "popular" a plane ever to displace the real poetry of the "Star-Spangled Banner."—"The Magic Cross" (Fischer \$0.75), by Eduardo Marzo, a new operetta for girls' voices, comprises solos, a duet, unison and two-part choruses; is easy, yet melodious and attractive musically. The

words, by Margaret E. Lacey, are of equal merit.—"Ireland the Footstool of Heaven" (Madison Music Pub. Co., Detroit), by C. F. Marks, is a new popular song of easy range and flowing melody, within reach of almost any voice or assembly of singers. The song is a portraiture of Ireland's charms, ending with the lines:

"And God never gave such beautiful things
To a place that He did not want free."

Some sixty British and American prose-writers, ranging from the fourteenth to the twentieth century and from Geoffrey Chaucer to Woodrow Wilson are represented in Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith's "A Treasury of English Prose" (Houghton, Mifflin, \$1.75). No anthologist succeeds of course, in thoroughly pleasing anybody but himself and the customary inquiries will be made by critics who wonder why Mr. Smith left out this favorite author of theirs, or put so much of that "mediocre writer" in; why Newman, Arnold and Stevenson are allowed but one page each while Charles Lamb gets twenty-one pages. The editor's taste on the whole is rather austere, John Donne, Sir Thomas Browne, Jeremy Taylor, John Milton and Ralph Waldo Emerson being, it would seem, his favorite authors. There are twenty-two pages of well-chosen passages from the King James Bible. Among the "missing" are Hilaire Belloc and Nathaniel Hawthorne.

The Marquise Clara Lanza contributes to the March *Bookman* entertaining reminiscences of "Literary New York in the Eighties" with descriptions of the resident and visiting lions of the day and Mrs. Aline Kilmer has these stanzas on "The Garden":

And now it is all to be done over again
And what will come of it only God can know.
What has become of the furrows ploughed by pain,
And the hopes set row on row?

Where are the lines of beautiful bending trees?
The gracious springs, the depths of delicate shade?
And evening spaces loud with the humming of bees,
And the grassy paths in the garden my life has made?

Lightning and earthquake now have blasted and riven,
Even the trees that I trusted could not stand;
Now it lies here to the bitter winds of Heaven
A barren and a desolated land.

John Hastings Turner's new novel, "A Place in the World" (Scribner, \$1.75) centers around Iris, a fair Russian woman with a past who is living in an English village when the war breaks out and is very successful in administering shocks to the conventional. Her champion is a sententious parson. The author's effort to keep the dialogue sparkling and clever grows tiresome.—"The Tidal Wave" (Putnam, \$1.75) by Ethel M. Dell, is a book of half-a-dozen love-stories conventional in plot but skillfully told.—Young married couples will find interesting "The Book of Marjorie" (Knopf) written by her anonymous husband. The slender volume seems to give a faithful account of the way a happily wedded pair faced and solved the problems of their new life. The author apparently believes that he "evolved" from some primordial photoplasm or other, and he thinks that little Peter should be left to "decide his religion for himself, just as later he will decide his politics." Poor Peterkin! "The only real happiness is home happiness" is the sane conclusion reached by the amiable Marjorie's eulogizer.—"Sheila Intervenes" (Doran) Stephen McKenna's latest book, is a novel about British politics just before the war. The meddlesome heroine undertakes to shape the career of Denys Playfair, M. P., and all the author's ingenuity is required to keep her from wrecking several lives. The dialogue is clever and the characters well drawn.

Children will like "Puppies and Kittens and Other Stories" (Dutton, \$1.60), which Mrs. Carine Cadby tells and which her husband illustrates with thirty-nine excellent photographs. There are twin doggies and a sumptuous Persian cat, who have adventures, and the doings of spiders and chickens are also described entertainingly.—"The Like-to-Do Stories" by Laura Rountree Smith, "Nonsense Rhymes and Animal Stories" by Alhambra G. Deming and "Animal-Land Children" by Margaret Flora (Beckley-Cardy Co., Chicago, \$0.55 each), are attractive and well-illustrated books designed to supplement the teacher's work in the primary grades. The first persuades little boys and girls that washing dishes, bringing in wood, etc., is really great fun, the second shows that even animals, when they talk, use grammatical English, and the third is full of delightful stories about foxes, moles, butterflies, etc.

Vachel Lindsay's "The Golden Whales of California and Other Rhymes in the American Language" (Macmillan, \$1.75) are some of the pieces this highly practical poet, as he travels through the country recites, instructing his audiences how to accompany him by making appropriate noises as he reads. "What is the fire-engine's ding-dong bell? The burden of the burble of the bull-frog in the well?" he asks. The answer is "Gold, gold, gold," a refrain in which Mr. Lindsay's listening admirers are expected to join after every line or two he shouts. "Here the audience roars with the leader, 'Grrrrr,' etc., is another entertaining rubric of "The Daniel Jazz," a typical Lindsay production quite as devoid of poetry as of reverence. "The Last Song of Lucifer," with lines in it like the following, seems to have more rhyme and reason than most of the "American-Language" doggerel in the book:

And the angels bowed down, for his glory was vast—
Loving their conqueror, weeping, aghast—
While we sobbed, for a moment repenting the past,
And the mock hope came, that eats and stings,
The hope for innocent dawns above,
The joy of it beat in our ears like wings,
Our iron cheeks seared with the tears of love.

So vast would be the detailed study of the *audiencias*, the famous tribunals erected by the Kings of Spain in their colonies and found in Manila, Mexico, Lima, Guadalajara, etc., that the writer of "The Audiencia in the Spanish Colonies," (Univ. of California Press), Mr. C. H. Cunningham of the University of Texas, has wisely confined himself to the study of a single one of these great courts, the *audiencia* of Manila. While the *audiencia* wherever found was primarily a judicial tribunal, and has been considered almost entirely in this light by those who have dealt with its history, it performed also the most important legislative, administrative, executive, and ecclesiastical functions. Mr. Cunningham brings out this side of their duties with authority and competence gained from a thorough examination of documents studied in the Philippines. The study of the Manila tribunal is confined to the period extending from the time of its erection at the close of the fifteenth century, to the end of the eighteenth. The author studies from an objective point of view such aspects of the *audiencia* as its relations with the Governor, the King and the Church. The *audiencia's* procedure was slow and complicated, and owing to the immense territories over which it had jurisdiction, the slowness of communication with the mother country, the verdicts were at times delayed until they became ineffective or useless. Yet the *audiencias* were on the whole a mighty instrument for order and law. If officials were incompetent, blundered, or were bribed, the tribunals themselves go far to prove that the Spanish monarchs were anxious to have justice done to Spaniard and native alike.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- D. Appleton & Co., New York:
From Upton to the Meuse with the 307th Infantry. By W. Kerr Rainsford. \$2.00.
- Benziger Brothers, New York:
The Love of Brothers. By Katherine Tynan Hinkson. \$1.75; The Catholic American. By Rev. George T. Schmidt. \$1.25; Lady Trent's Daughter. A Novel. By Isabel C. Clarke. \$1.75.
- Boni & Liveright, New York:
Current Social and Industrial Forces. Edited by Lionel D. Edie. \$2.50; Hey Rub-a-Dub-Dub. A Book of the Mystery and Wonder and Terror of Life. By Theodore Dreiser. \$2.00.
- Bonne Presse, 5 rue Bayard, Paris:
Fleurs de Paix. Fleurs de Guerre. Par Charles Baussan. 2 fr.
- Burns & Oates, Ltd., London:
The Catholic Directory. Ecclesiastical Register and Almanac for 1920. 2/6.
- The Catholic Truth Society of Canada, Toronto:
The Trials of a Mind. Revised by Rev. Wm. B. Hannon. By L. Silliman Ives, LL.D., Late Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in North Carolina.
- The Century Co., New York:
The Matrix. By Maria Thompson Daviess. \$1.75; Coggin. By Ernest Oldmeadow. \$1.35.
- Columbia University Press, New York:
Religion and Culture. A Critical Survey of Methods of Approach to Religious Phenomena. By Frederick Schleier, Ph.D. \$2.00.
- The Cornhill Co., Boston:
Wind and Blue Water. By Laura Armstead Carter. \$1.25.
- Dodd, Mead & Co., New York:
Westminster Cathedral and its Architect. By Winefride De L'Hôpital. With an Introduction by Professor W. B. Lethaby, F. R. I. B. A. With 160 Illustrations. In Two Volumes. \$12.00; Poland and the Poles. By A. Bruce Boswell, M.A. With Twenty-One Illustrations and Three Maps. \$4.00.
- George H. Doran Co., New York:
The Survival of Man. A Study in Unrecognized Human Faculty. By Sir Oliver Lodge, F.R.S. New and Enlarged Edition. \$3.00; Sheila Intervenes. By Stephen McKenna. \$1.75.
- Doubleday, Page & Co., Garden City, N. Y.:
Hand-Made Fables. By George Ade. Illustrated by John T. McCutcheon. \$1.60.
- General Commission of the Churches, New York:
War-Time Agencies of the Churches. Directory and Handbook. Edited by Margaret Renton.
- M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., Dublin:
Life of the Ven. Anne Madeleine Rémuzat. Religious of the Order of the Visitation, 1669-1730. By the Sisters of the Visitation of Harrow. With Twelve Illustrations. 6 s.
- Harcourt, Brace & Howe, New York:
The Economic Consequences of the Peace. By John Maynard Keynes C.B. Thirtieth Thousand. \$2.50.
- Houghton, Mifflin Co., Boston:
The Penance of Magdalena and Other Tales of the California Missions. By J. Smeaton Chase. \$2.00; Basil Everman. By Elsie Singmaster. \$1.90.
- P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York:
The British and Anglo-Saxon Period. History of England Series. By Ernest R. Hull, S.J. \$0.50.
- Alfred A. Knopf, New York:
The Book of Marjorie; Six Theosophic Points and Other Writings. By Jacob Böhme. Newly Translated into English by John Rolleston Earle, M.A.
- Rev. Joseph Kovalchik, 558 Bostwick Ave., Bridgeport:
The Pilgrims. Melodrama in Three Acts; The Soul of Humanity (Tragedy of the Earth) Prologue and Three Acts. By Rev. Joseph Kovalchik.
- Laird & Lee, Inc., Chicago:
Vanishing Landmarks: The Trend Toward Bolshevism. By Leslie M. Shaw. \$1.00; Back to the Republic. By Harry F. Atwood. \$1.00; Keep God in American History. By Harry F. Atwood.
- J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia:
The Worker and His Work. Readings in Present-Day Literature Presenting Some of the Activities by Which Men and Women the World Over Make a Living. Compiled by Stella Stewart Center, A.B., A.M. Illustrated. \$2.00.
- Little, Brown & Co., Boston:
The Great Impersonation. By E. Phillips Oppenheim. \$1.75; Fire of Youth. By Henry J. Forman. \$1.75.
- Longmans, Greene & Co., New York:
Morning Knowledge, the Story of the New Inquisition. By Alastair Shannon. \$5.00; From Dust to Glory. By M. J. Phelan, S.J. \$1.50; Mount Music. By E. G. Somerville and Martin Ross. \$2.00; Salve Mater. By Frederick Joseph Kinsman. \$2.25.
- The Macmillan Co., New York:
The Parish Gilds of Medieval England. By H. F. Westlake, M.A., F.S.A. The Gild State, Its Principles and Possibilities. By G. R. Stirling Taylor.
- Oxford University Press, New York:
On the Relations Between Spoken and Written Language with Special Reference to English. By Henry Bradley, M.A., Hon. Litt.D.
- G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York:
The Lure of the Pen, a Book for Would-be Authors. By Flora Klickmann; Danny Again. Further Adventures of "Danny the Detective." By Vera C. Barclay. Illustrated.
- Charles Scribner's Sons, New York:
A Place in the World. By John Hastings Turner. \$1.75; Modes and Morals. By Katherine Fullerton Gerould. \$1.75.
- Silver, Burdett & Co., Boston:
The Community Center. By L. J. Hanifan.
- The University of Chicago Press, Chicago:
A Short History of Belgium. By Leon Van der Essen, Ph.D., LL.D. Second Revised and Enlarged Edition. \$1.50.
- Yale University Press, New Haven:
The Medieval Attitude Toward Astrology. Particularly in England. By Theodore Otto Wedel.

SOCIOLOGY

Americanism and the Eighteenth Amendment

THEORETICALLY, the American Government is a government established by the people. The people, not the Government, are the source of power. The people, not the Government, are the masters. The Government confers no right upon the people, but whatever right is possessed by the Government has been delegated by the people. These rights are strictly limited by constitutional writ, and may be further limited, or even recalled as the people see fit. There are no "subjects" in this country, and no rulers, and we obey no man. All officials, local, State and Federal, from the President down, are our servants. Whatever respect is paid an official, is given not to the man but to the law which created him. We ourselves are the masters, and owing obedience to no individual, we obey the law which we ourselves have framed. If a measure proposed is accepted by the majority, it is the law, and it must be obeyed. But there is no majority, however large, which can violate the rights of the minority.

THE NECESSITY OF FREE SPEECH.

HENCE, in a popular, representative government, it is not fitting that a minority be deprived of the right of petition against wrongs, real or fancied. Under our form of government, a minority to whom a law is distasteful, may freely voice their opposition. They may speak against it, write against it, organize against it, vote against it. They may do anything against it, except disobey it, or counsel others to disobey it. If by speaking, writing, and organizing, they can bring other citizens, in sufficient number, to their way of thinking, they can overturn the law, not by bullets but by ballots. This right thus to change, has no limitations. Under the American form of government, there are no immutable laws. The people, if they so wish, can abolish our form of government. If they can do that, they can also abolish any article or clause of the Constitution, or any amendment, or any law whatsoever, State or Federal. The people framed this Government; when they desire, they may change it or destroy it, and every citizen must be free to express his opinion on any department of government, on any public servant, or on any law, holding himself to the responsibility which he himself has laid down in Federal or State Constitution.

The need of free speech and the right to print is supreme in a representative government. Without it, rule passes from people to officials; tyranny supplants wise and lawful government, and the right of the citizen to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness becomes a mere phrase. History shows that men, when they are forbidden freely to express their thoughts on matters of government and to devise changes of law or in administration by peaceful means, always have recourse to plots and violence. A free press and free speech are not political luxuries, but the necessary concomitants of a free people. And it is particularly necessary that a legislator be free to speak his mind in legislative deliberation, and to urge the adoption, amendment or abolition of any law whatsoever, coming within the jurisdiction of that body.

ARE WE TRAITORS?

THESE are truisms to Americans, but with the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment, they are boldly denied. We are told that unless we accept the Eighteenth Amendment as final and immutable, we are disloyal. We are forbidden to discuss the meaning of any word or phrase in that Amendment, unless we first accept the ruling of a clique of bigots and fanatics, calling itself a League. We are informed that unless we relinquish the right of criticising this Amendment, or any law which Congress may adopt, and "give both a full and free chance to operate," we are again guilty of treason. That proposition is absolutely false. What treason is, has been established by the Constitution, and, if we are true to our trust, the

declarations of John Marshall on this clause of the Constitution will remain unimpaired long after we have learned to be ashamed of the excesses into which we were stampeded during the last years of the World War. Wrongs are at our doors, and protest is barred. With the coming of the Eighteenth Amendment the sovereignty of the States is again invaded, thereby still further disturbing that constitutional balance of power without which the American government of our fathers is an absolute impossibility. Not only are the rights and liberties of citizens curtailed without sufficient reason, but we are bidden, in the name of good citizenship, to abolish the right of free speech, protected against the encroachment of Congress by the First Amendment, and safeguarded in the Bill of Rights of every State in the Union. And if we are not willing thus to forswear our rights and duties as American citizens, and as citizens of our respective States, we are a disorderly mob, whose every action drags us deeper into the slough of treason, outlaws, the fit objects of blackguardism and scurrility.

All this is of daily record throughout the country. A league of bigots and fanatics, skilfully engineered by tap-room politicians, orders that Americans who exercised their right to vote against the Eighteenth Amendment, or who believe that it should be repealed, must be defeated at the polls. These Americans may possess the qualifications of Washington or Lincoln, but it avails them not. There are no State Constitutions, and the Federal Constitution consists of the Eighteenth Amendment only. Thus is a bitter fanaticism, compared with which the old "Know-nothing" movement is the summation of justice and benevolence, again introduced into American politics.

THE "BREWER OF BIGOTRY" AGAIN

IN New York the "brewer of bigotry" again rushes to the fore. Acting within his rights as a citizen, and in conformity with his oath as a member of the New York State Assembly, Colonel Ransom H. Gillet introduced a bill under the concurrent jurisdiction clause of the Eighteenth Amendment. He is met, not with argument, but with personal abuse by the chosen leader who recently enhanced his popularity with the Anti-Saloon League by attacking the Catholic Church:

Last fall you swaggered out of the way to be offensive to the moral element, represented by the Anti-Saloon League. When we promptly put a beer brand on you you exhibited your lacerated feelings all around your part of the state. Your recent antics in behalf of the brewers have convinced the public that we were right last fall.

Yesterday you butted into the hearing on the enforcement bills for the purpose of asserting that the constituency of a majority of the churches of the state are "special interests" and in the same category with the brewers. The people whom you slandered yesterday were fighting the Germans years before you began in order to avert a peril which you had neither the intelligence to comprehend, the moral instinct to resent, nor the courage to oppose.

The fact that you were a patriot during the recent war does not relieve you of the obligation to be a patriot now. Your efforts in behalf of nullification are an insult to the memory of the heroes of another war who were just as brave and far more intelligent than you and who died or risked all to kill nullification.

There is something wrong with either the head or the heart of a man who fought the imperial German government in France to establish the political freedom of the world and then comes home to help the German brewers (who contributed to the support of that same German government) to regain control of American politics.

Therefore, to introduce a bill in a legislative assembly is "nullification," and to suggest a reasonable interpretation of the Eighteenth Amendment is equivalent to a support of the government of the late Kaiser Wilhelm.

More than a year ago, I wrote that the adoption of the Eighteenth Amendment meant the beginning of the downfall of the American form of government rather than the downfall of the saloon. I see no reason why I should reverse that judgment.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

EDUCATION

A Broken System and the Smith Bill

MOST Catholic children are wonderful little creatures. But all of them have three dimensions. To this rule, I do not know a single exception. I am neither a mathematician nor a physicist, and because his theory may destroy the few faint notions to which I cling, touching the nature of quantity, mass and space, I abhor the name of Einstein. Yet, despite these deficiencies, I make bold to say that if our Catholic children are to conform to decrees ordering them into the public schools, they must forthwith put on another dimension, or drop one or two which they now possess. Fashioned as they are, I fear they must remain in *statu quo*. For some public schools are so overcrowded that they cannot take another pupil, be he even as thin as Oliver Twist, while other public schools have plenty of space but no teachers.

CRAMPED SCHOOLS

ON the very day that a publicity-seeker, to invoke the maximum of charitable thought, introduced a resolution in the New York Assembly, providing that all children between the ages of five and sixteen must attend the public schools, the New York *Tribune* featured an article to show that the city of New York was utterly unable to take care of the more than 900,000 children enrolled in these schools. What would happen if the 100,000 children of the parish schools were thrown upon the city, can be fathomed even by minds that cannot brook the interesting theory of the versatile Doctor Einstein. As I remarked, and not at random, with all his gifts a Catholic child must have some space in which to be educated, space, I mean, in a class-room. New York is very short on class-room space. That has been the complaint in the metropolis for many years. With good school boards and with poor, the result was practically the same; there were never enough buildings to accommodate the children. And to return to our Catholic child; even if you find a place for him in some school-room, he must have a teacher. But, just at present, New York is not only short on class-room space, but even more curtailed on teachers. Some of them are selling candy and some are selling insurance, but not many of them are selling their time to the cause of education. Nor can they be blamed. A teacher must live, and to live in New York on a New York teacher's salary requires a genius which is something more than a capacity to take infinite pains.

ABSENT TEACHERS

ACCORDING to the *Tribune*, in the week from February 24 to March 2, 1,293 classes, numbering more than 36,000 children, were sent home "because there was no teacher." Comparing the same period in the previous month, these figures show an increase of 193 classes. The situation of classes without teachers has become so commonplace, that the schools have been supplied with mimeographed slips, to be given to the children dismissed, stating that the child has been sent home "because there is no teacher for the class."

There are not enough teachers. There are too few substitutes. Not only are the teachers already in service steadily dropping away to find positions which pay a more nearly approximate living wage, but fewer young men and women are taking up teaching as a profession.

What is true of New York, seems to be true in a measure of the whole country, although there is some reason to believe that the figures have been "trained" for propaganda purposes. Dr. Claxton's Bureau of Education, which in these days is much like a personal perquisite of the incumbent, recently announced that 18,279 schools had been closed because of a lack of teachers, and that 41,900 were in the hands of teachers "below the standard." On November 1, 1919, 190 normal schools, representing sixty per cent of such schools, showed a decrease of 11,503 students, compared with November 1, 1918. This indicated a

falling off of nearly 20,000 normal-school students in the entire country. It is the opinion of the Bureau that the most prominent cause of the decreasing number of teachers is the lack of a living-wage in the profession. The average salary in 1918, according to A. O. Neal of the Bureau, was \$606 in the elementary, and \$1,031 in the high schools. In the rural districts it was common to find salaries as low as \$150 or \$200, coupled with a wretched schoolplant, and almost impossible living conditions for the teacher.

NO FEDERAL REDRESS

THERE are two main reasons why the Federal Government can do nothing directly to improve these conditions. The first reason is that the Government has no teacher's license. Schools and educational concerns generally are under the exclusive control of the States and the local communities. The Federal Government can do those things only which it is authorized to do by the Federal Constitution, either explicitly or by necessary implication. If, of course, "necessary implication" means that the Federal Government is empowered to do anything that is desirable from a general standpoint of health, happiness, and morality, then the Constitution, which is a charter of limitations set by the people upon the government, not of rights inherent in the government, had better be abolished. It is of importance to the general welfare, in fact, few things are of greater importance, that young men contemplating the matrimonial state, be supplied with suitable partners. It is also important that the needy orphans be fathered and de-adenoided. But it is no business of the Federal Government, to conduct a matrimonial bureau, or to maintain orphanages.

The second reason for Federal exclusion is that the Federal Government always "makes a mess of it," when it undertakes to do things which it was never intended to do. With his "snaix, onparallelled wax figgers, and eddicated cangeroo, an amosin' little beest, and hily moril" Artemus Ward was a great showman, but he got into deep water and much trouble when he tried to teach his theory of government to the Secessionists. That was not his "fort." Similarly, if the Federal Government undertakes to invade the respective States, for the purpose of teaching the benighted inhabitants how to conduct the schools, it will certainly set up a political control of the State educational systems, but it will not succeed in building more schoolhouses, or in finding more teachers. "If you centralize the control and supervision of education in the Federal Government," said Senator Frelinghuysen recently, "you cannot prevent politics from creeping in. And politics means, in my opinion, the breaking down of the educational system throughout the country." The Smith bill does not mean more schools and better teachers. It means in the first place, a violation of the spirit if not of the actual letter of the Constitution, and it means in the second place, a school system in every State under the complete domination of politicians, and all subject to a politician at Washington, selected primarily because he is a Democrat, a Republican, a Populist or an Anti-Saloonist.

DUTY OF THE STATE

DEEP in my consciousness is a suspicion that the public-school system, for all its niggardly policy towards its teachers, is somewhat healthier than will be allowed by the propagandists now attempting a diagnosis. But even granting that the schools are overcrowded, and that they lack qualified teachers, it must yet be shown that old Dr. Smith has brewed a panacea. For there are many who consider Dr. Smith's offering a poison merely. If the schools are to be improved, the duty rests with the respective States and with the local communities. If a State is incapable of self-government and self-determination in this or in any other department, it may be ruled from Washington as a province or a police district, but it can no longer be regarded as a commonwealth of free and intelligent citizens.

P. L. B.

NOTE AND COMMENT

Vast Plans for Catholic Charities in New York

THE immediate result of the recent survey of the Catholic charities of the New York archdiocese will be the formation, under Archbishop Hayes, of a permanent organization of not fewer than 20,000 members. Working under an executive Committee of the Laity, with the Archbishop as its presiding officer, will be sixteen district committees, corresponding to each of the sixteen geographical sections of the archdiocese. Auxiliary committees will be appointed for each parish, so that the most efficient men and women of each congregation may participate in this immense work. The first purpose of the great body, thus organized, will be the financing of the six bureaus that are to embrace all the local charities. To underwrite this vast undertaking an income of \$500,000 will be required in the beginning. This amount is not however to be collected by a money-drive. The plan adopted by the Archbishop is rather to have the Committee of the Laity cooperate in securing a pledged supporting membership for the Catholic charities. To this end he expects many thousands of contributors to volunteer their help over a period of years. The leading idea, therefore, is to make permanent an organization similar to that which produced such excellent results during the K. of C. campaign in 1918. The constructive work itself is for the present to consist in co-ordinating, standardizing and extending the existing charitable institutions and organizations. The chairman of the Executive Committee is Mr. George J. Gillespie, President of the Supreme Council of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, of the United States.

The Bishops' Department of Social Action

THE department of Social Action of the National Catholic Welfare Council, formed some months ago under the chairmanship of Bishop Muldoon, has now entered upon active service. It will for the present deal mainly with questions of citizenship and industrial relations, interesting itself also in charitable organizations. Thus it offers to give, upon request, information and advice concerning diocesan institutions of the later kind. It will try to stimulate progressive work in the fields of Americanization and labor. Lectures dealing with the subjects proper to this department will be offered free to colleges and seminaries. Information will be supplied personally or through the press and lecture platform. Social study clubs will be advised and encouraged by the department in order that Catholic action for the good of society may be carried on more intelligently and on a larger scale. In particular it will try to make known the doctrine of the Church on these subjects of supreme importance. It will gather into separate volumes the important documents on citizenship, labor problems and social service to make them easily available, and will serve in general as a clearing house for the best Catholic study on these topics. The offices of the department are located at 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. It is especially at the service of Bishops, priests and Catholic organizations in the United States. The immediate charge of the Bureau of Social Action is given to John A. Lapp, D.D. and the Rev. John A. Ryan, D.D.

The Maryphobia of Methodism

A POEM by an unknown author, which Blanche M. Kelly, Litt.D., has found worthy to serve as the prologue of her book, "Mary the Mother," is quoted entire in the editorial columns of the Methodist *Epworth Herald*, as a scarlet example of the hopelessness of "Roman Catholicism." The poem, which had been reprinted with special approval in the pages of AMERICA,

dilates, "in linked sweetness long drawn out," upon the simple theme of the motherhood of Mary. Holding Christ within her breast, she was the chalice and He the Sacred Blood, she the temple and He the temple's Lord, she the shrine and He the God who dwelled therein. Bringing Him into the world, she was the dawn and He the perfect Day, she the root and He the mystic Vine, she the bush and He the rose that bloomed therefrom, she the fount and He the cleansing Flood. These are but the poet's ways of saying that Mary is the Mother and Christ her Son; from which it follows as a necessary corollary that honor is due to Mary, though adoration is given to Christ alone, and that while Christ has all favors to bestow, Mary has the power to win them for us from her Son and King. Nor does it make Him the less our "one Lord and Mediator" because by Mary's hand we may choose to come to Him and she lifts up with us her voice of supplication. Is it a "travesty on devotion" that even here on earth a mother prays with her child and for it, as such criticism must of necessity imply? Does it make Christ the less our one supreme Mediator with the Father? There is nothing in the poet's lines but the beautiful statement of the most obvious every-day relations that everywhere exist between mother and son. Yet these relations are intensified and perfected beyond all words in the relationship existing between Mary the Mother, and Christ her Son. What then can be more unnatural than this fear or hatred of the Mother of Our Saviour?

In the Ward Nursery

"BISHOP WARD was born of rich but honest parents," says the London *Tablet*, with a reminiscent side-glance at Mark Twain. In a delightful strain it recounts the early home life of the late Bishop Ward. The Ward nursery was a sort of sacristy, we are told, where the children were "prepared exclusively for another and a better world." It is for that reason they proved so fit to meet the struggles of the present brief interval of waiting. The following is the description given by Wilfrid Ward himself:

The imitative instinct which leads many boys and girls to play at being soldiers or sailors led us to play at being priests and nuns. On Easter Sunday, 1863, I was deacon, being then seven years old; my brother Bernard, who acted as subdeacon, was six, and my eldest brother, who was the celebrating priest, nine. I still know by heart the Gregorian music and words of St. Augustine's beautiful hymn, the "Exultet" which, as deacon, aged eight years, I was taught to sing for the blessing of our toy Pascal candle. My brother Bernard, as subdeacon, learnt the short epistle for Easter Day when he could hardly read at all.

The result of that training is thus happily summarized: "My three sisters, who became nuns, and my youngest brother, who is a priest, continued the way of life we had learned as children. To them life was, on the whole, what they had from the first been taught to expect." We have heard of the battle of Waterloo being won on the Eton college-fields. But the great battles of these six noble lives were largely won on the nursery floor.

A Cardinal Pleads for Dying Austria

THE following letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Vienna will certainly leave no heart untouched. Readers can be well assured that it contains no exaggeration. He says:

In the name of God and humanity we are appealing to you. Hear our lamentation, you who suffer neither hunger nor cold. During four and a half years we have borne the afflictions of a war which we did not wish and could not end. In the fifth year peace came, but not the end of our miseries, these still grew worse and worse, exceeding all measure.

Separated from the economic bases we had held for centuries, almost entirely deprived of coal and natural resources,

without means of transportation, weighed down by debts and unable to help ourselves, we are pining away in misery that is indescribable. All our willingness to work and our training are of no avail. Our children have been perishing with cold; we had neither warm clothes for them nor fuel. Our population is wasted with hunger. Strong men are languishing away. The old are dying a painful death, because not even the slightest relief can be given them. Cruel and terrible is our fate!

As Catholics we call upon the whole Catholic world, and especially upon the Catholics of America and plead for help. We are in need of clothes, shoes, linen, and money to procure the necessities of life. Food in particular must be procured. Help us, O people of America, help us quickly and generously! We are not numerous as you, but our penury is extreme. Many must come to our aid or we perish. May Heaven reward the assistance you give us, since we can but feebly express our gratitude.

The grewsome picture of "Death in Life" finds its awful realization in Vienna. The little children are too feeble to play in the streets. Considerable alms have been forwarded through AMERICA. Those desiring to help might perhaps best do so through the Central Bureau of the Central Society, 201 Temple Building, St. Louis, Mo. Even small donations from many hands can bring a great relief, as the Cardinal suggests.

The Business of Buying Churches

THAT Protestant pastors are leaving their pulpits because they cannot preach to empty benches was the confession recently made by the Rev. Joseph F. Newton, in the Church of the Divine Paternity at New York, according to the *New York American*:

What is the country coming to? Twenty per cent of the pastors that were with us before the war have resigned to enter other occupations. Of our 110,000,000 people no more than 44,000,000 attend religious services. Today there are 3,000,000 fewer children attending Sunday School than there were in the year before the war.

The other day a man came to see me and asked if I wanted to sell my church. I said, "Is that your business—buying churches?" "Yes," he replied, "that is my regular business, selling churches."

The great problem of the Catholic churches, as has been mentioned here before, is to find room for the numbers who attend the successive Sunday Masses. The mistake is that we rest too much contented with those who come to us instead of using to the full the opportunities of apostleship, lay and clerical, that now offer themselves. May the near future see the number of our churches trebled.

Why Jews Object to Shylock

THE demand for the elimination of the "Merchant of Venice" from the literary courses in our public schools is now of constant recurrence. It is well therefore to hear from a competent Jewish source the argument for this demand. We shall find it briefly given in the *Jewish Criterion*, in answer to Mr. Sothern's suggestion that if Shylock is excluded from our schools other groups might similarly object to other characters in Shakespeare. After delicately appraising Mr. Sothern as one of the finest artists in the history of modern dramatic art, the *Criterion* holds that he fails entirely to appreciate the real value of the objection made on the part of the Jewish people, and thus continues:

The Jew is discriminated against for many reasons, among them being the charge that he is a Shylock; just remember that one point, Mr. Sothern; he is falsely accused by the ignorant ignorant and the educated ignorant, as one who demands his pound of flesh; that he is harsh, relentless, pitiless and unfeeling in demanding the uttermost farthing that is due him. The term Shylock carries with it a scorn and contempt that only one who has it used against him can understand. That there are Jews as there are Christians

who are Shylocks and worse, no one denies, but unfortunately, as Mr. Sothern should know, Jews are "lumped together" so to speak; they are discriminated against *en masse* as a group; they are charged with certain shortcomings as a group; they are accused of being rich as a group; of being agitators as a group, and so on. So we ask Mr. Sothern if he thinks it proper that a character should be studied by impressionable and immature minds that tends to foment a spirit of hatred and against a people of which the character purports to be a type. As we have said on many occasions certain very well-meaning and learned gentlemen have found this or that admirable trait in Shylock and they have solemnly declared that Shakespeare had something else in mind than that which we find on the surface in the lines. We don't believe anything of the sort and we are quite sure that most young folk who read of Shylock put him down as quite a merciless gentleman and hate him accordingly without regard to the circumstances which made him as he was.

Shakespeare's play, in many ways, reflects little credit either upon Jew or Christian, but it is easy to understand the main contention of the Jewish writer, who sees in it a well-head of popular prejudice against his race.

A Model Catholic Lay Organization

WHEN the Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia was first established an extended reference was made to it in these columns as an ideal organization, fostering the spirit of the lay apostolate and promising to accomplish great things for the cause of the Church and of the country. It has since developed consistently with the promise it then gave. Those interested in the nature of its work and the details of the organization can readily procure Bishop Keiley's interesting pamphlet upon the subject "The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia." He shows how after a careful examination of 3,500 editorials dealing with Catholic subjects, that appeared in the various Georgia papers during the last year, there were not one hundred which were in any way offensive, while the files of the Publicity Bureau of the laymen's association are filled with letters of thanks for information on Catholic questions, and requests for further light. Yet five years ago there was not more than one single paper in the entire State that did not either attack the Church, or print attacks upon her, or copy regularly in its columns articles reflecting on her teaching and practices. Out of 180 papers there are today not more than three, including Watson's sheet and a so-called religious (!) paper published in Atlanta, that attack the Catholic Church. Conversions, too, have been numerous. Here is the method of operation:

The bureau, after publishing a carefully worded advertisement, receives a letter from someone asking in a general way for information. They send him "The Plea for Peace," a simple little article appealing to all for any reason why all Georgians, Catholics as well as Protestants, should not live in peace and harmony. They send with the pamphlet a stamped envelope addressed to the Laymen's Association, and they ask if the correspondent needs any specific information to please ask for it, and they will gladly send it. If the man replies that he would gladly know what the Catholic Church teaches, they send him "The Faith of Our Fathers," of which they have distributed a great number of copies. If he asks for information on some point covered by one of the bureau's pamphlets, they send him copies.

The pamphlets to which reference is made here, and which have been prepared to meet the special needs of the citizens of the State and to answer their particular difficulties are: "Catholics and Marriage," "Catholics and the Bible," "Catholics in American History," "Catholics in Georgia," "Catholics and the Public Schools," "A Plea for Peace," "The Pope and the War," "Catholics and Politics." These indeed are subjects of interest to all non-Catholics everywhere. We cannot too highly recommend the work of this apostolic organization. Communications to it should be addressed: The Catholic Laymen's Association of Georgia, 107 9th Street, Augusta, Ga.